

DURABLE WHITENESS: STRUCTURAL SETTLER COLONIALISM IN CALIFORNIA
AND SOUTHERN OREGON THEATRE, 1849-1860 AND 2018-2019

by

WAYLON CONRAD LENK

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Department of Theatre Arts
and the Division of Graduate Studies of the
University of Oregon in partial fulfillment of the
requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

June 2021

DISSERTATION APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Waylon Conrad Lenk

Title: Durable Whiteness: Structural Settler Colonialism in California and Southern Oregon Theatre, 1849-1860 and 2019

This dissertation has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in the Department of Theatre Arts by:

Michael Malek Najjar	Chairperson
Raoul Liévanos	Advisor
Theresa May	Core Member
Kirby Brown	Institutional Representative

and

Andy Karduna	Interim Vice Provost for Graduate Studies
--------------	---

Original approval signatures are on file with the University of Oregon Division of Graduate Studies.

Degree awarded May 2021.

© 2021 Waylon Conrad Lenk

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

Waylon Conrad Lenk

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Theatre Arts

June 2021

Title: Durable Whiteness: Structural Settler Colonialism in California and Southern Oregon Theatre, 1849-1860 and 2019

Theatre and Performance Studies have studied the ways in which theatre and performance act as auxiliaries of hegemonic state power at least since Boal's *Theatre of the Oppressed* explored the ways in which classical Greek dramaturgy coerced its audiences into pro-state behavior. Meanwhile, the theatre industry often makes interventions into the White racial hegemony that dominates the United States while in some ways reinstating the very dramaturgies that serve to oppress Indigenous Peoples, Black People, and other People of Color (Holledge & Tompkins, McDonnell). Professional theatre would be well served by looking to the critiques of scholars like Boal as well as Diana Taylor, Jisha Menon, and Rustom Bharucha. These scholars critique theatre outside the United States and since, as Laura Pulido observes, race is experienced locally, a regional analysis of theatre as an auxiliary of White hegemonic state power in the United States is needed. My dissertation focuses on the region directly affected by the California Gold Rush, which includes all of California as well as southwestern Oregon, to demonstrate how theatre participated and continues to participate in the establishment of power that oppresses Blacks, Indigenous Peoples and People of Color. I do so by using eventful historical-sociology (Sewell) to describe the Gold Rush as an event that

restructured race in the Gold Rush region, and Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) to compare indicators of white hegemony in Gold Rush plays with plays produced in the same region in 2019. I conclude by offering policy recommendations which range from the industry-specific like emphasizing dramaturgies that highlight non-white histories and increasing access for non-white labor in professional theatre to broader reaching interventions concerning minority language rights for local tribal languages and Spanish.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Waylon Conrad Lenk

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene
State University of New York, Stony Brook
Lewis & Clark College, Portland

DEGREES AWARDED:

Doctor of Philosophy, Theatre Arts, 2021, University of Oregon
Master of Fine Arts, Dramaturgy, 2012, State University of New York, Stony Brook
Bachelor of Arts, Theatre and German Studies, 2008, Lewis & Clark College

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

Native theatre
Gold Rush history

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Consultant, Paramount Pictures, 2021-
Graduate Employee, University of Oregon, 2016-2021
Dramaturg, University of Portland, 2020-2021
Dramaturg, Play On, 2016-2019
Dramaturg, Oregon Shakespeare Festival, 2016-2017
Graduate Employee, State University of New York, Stony Brook, 2009-2012
Dramaturg, Camelot Theatre, 2008-2011

GRANTS, AWARDS, AND HONORS:

Graduate Teaching Fellowship, University of Oregon, 2016-2021
Marks Scholarship, University of Oregon, 2017-2020

Native Artist Development Grant, *Something Spoken, Something Heard*, The Evergreen State College, 2016

Vice Provost of Student Affairs Grant, First Nations Readings, Oregon State University, 2014

Film Grant, *Living Stories*, Puffin Foundation, 2013

Graduate Teaching Fellowship, State University of New York, Stony Brook, 2009-2012

PUBLICATIONS:

Lenk, Waylon. "The Ins and Outs of the Indigenous Dick Joke: A Thorough Yet Noninvasive Look at Our Most Famous Tribal Member." *Multiple Ways of Knowing*. Ed. Jennifer Markides & Laura Forsythe. Dio Press Inc. 2019.

Lenk, Waylon. "Early Indigenous North American Cartography as Performance Texts." *Looking Back and Living Forward: Indigenous Research Rising Up*. Ed. Jennifer Markides & Laura Forsythe. Brill Sense. 2018.

Lenk, Waylon. "Off the Rails." *Illuminations*. Ed. Catherine Foster. Oregon Shakespeare Festival. 2017.

Lenk, Waylon. "Native Theatre in Oregon." Howlround.com. 2015.

Jamieson, Dawn and Waylon Lenk. "Dawn Jamieson talks MANGLED BEAMS with Waylon Lenk." Lark Play Development Center. www.larktheatre.org. 2015.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project came in to being while I was working on separate projects with Michael Malek Najjar and Raoul Liévanos at the University of Oregon, and Randy Reinholz and Bill Rauch at the Oregon Shakespeare Festival. Without their support this dissertation would not have been possible. I would also like to thank Theresa May and Kirby Brown, who served on the committee for this dissertation. Lue Douthit was the person who initially brought me on to the Literary Department at the Oregon Shakespeare Festival, and whose ongoing mentorship has been invaluable. I am also grateful for the moral support from my parents Karen Young-Lenk and Martin Lenk, and from my friends Amy Jensen and Ellen Kress. This work was supported by a Graduate Teaching Fellowship and a Marks Scholarship. My ability to see the number of plays that I did during my field work would not have been possible without my mother giving me complementary tickets from her then job as an usher at the Oregon Shakespeare Festival.

This dissertation is dedicated to my *xúupsa* Emma Pearch, who survived the Gold Rush.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
Literature Review.....	5
Argument and Methodology	19
Chapter Overviews.....	28
II. CHAPTER II: 1849-1860.....	31
Anglo-Saxons.....	33
Germans	50
Social Position	50
On Stage.....	52
French	53
Social Position	53
On Stage.....	55
Latin Americans.....	56
Social Position	56
On Stage.....	59
Chinese.....	61
Social Position	61
On Stage.....	64
Blacks.....	66
Social Position	66
On Stage.....	68

Chapter	Page
Pacific Islanders	71
Social Position	71
On Stage.....	71
Indians	73
Social Position	73
On Stage.....	79
Conclusion	83
III. CHAPTER III: 2018-2019.....	88
Racial Hierarchy	90
Political Engagement	90
Cultural Engagement	95
Hispanic or Latino.....	107
Social Position	107
On Stage.....	111
Asian	117
Social Position	117
On Stage.....	121
Black	130
Social Position	130
On Stage.....	132
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	134
Social Position	134

Chapter	Page
On Stage.....	136
American Indian and Alaska Native	136
Social Position	136
On Stage.....	139
Conclusion	144
IV. CHAPTER IV: QUALITATIVE COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	147
Outcome Variables and Unites of Analysis	149
English-language Performance	149
Nostalgic Performance.....	151
Theatre as a Site of Political Organization	154
Spectacle versus Simulation	155
All Outcomes	161
Pathways to and from English-language Performance	161
Pathways to and from Nostalgic Performance.....	165
Pathways to and from Theatre Used as a Site of Political Organization	175
Spectacle versus Simulation	179
All Outcomes	193
Conclusion	196
V. CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION.....	199
Away from English-language Performance	200
Away from Nostalgic Performance	206
Theatres not Used as Sites of Political Organization	210

Chapter	Page
Neither Spectacle nor Simulation	212
Knocking Down All Four Pillars	216
APPENDICES	222
A. DEFINITIONS, CODING, AND MEANS FOR VARIABLES USED IN THE QUALITATIVE COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	222
B. TRUTH TABLE.....	224
REFERENCES CITED.....	227

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Publicly Funded Art from Restrictive to Inclusive	99
2. Arts Attendance by Occupation in California.....	102
3. Racial Composition in California Professions with Highest Arts Attendance	104
4. Pathways to English-language Performance.....	161
5. Pathways to Non-English-language Performance	163
6. Pathway to Nostalgic Performance	165
7. Pathways to Non-nostalgic Performance	169
8. Pathways to Theatre Used as a Site of Political Organization.....	175
9. Pathway to Theatre not Used as a Site of Political Organization	177
10. Pathways to Spectacle.....	178
11. Pathways to Simulation.....	184
12. Pathways to All Outcomes.....	192
13. Pathway to None of the Outcomes.....	193

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 2017 I co-dramaturged the Oregon Shakespeare Festival's production of *Off The Rails*. Randy Reinholz's (Choctaw) adaptation of *Measure for Measure*, which sought to shed light on the Indian boarding schools, was the first Native mainstage play to be performed in OSF's 82-year history. It had received its workshop production in 2015 at Native Voices at the Autry, the Native theatre to work exclusively with members of the Actors Equity union in the United States. During the final act of the Native Voices production, the regulars at the Stewed Prunes Saloon auditioned for Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show. A fundraising stunt that they had done at Native Voices was to allow one lucky donor to come on stage dressed as Buffalo Bill (or Annie Oakley if the donor was female).

We did not use this strategy at OSF. After a discussion involving stage management and the cast, and then a follow-up discussion between Reinholz, director Bill Rauch and dramaturgs (Jean Bruce Scott, Alison Carey, and me), it was decided that that was a bad idea. At OSF the donor was most likely to be White. The idea of working-class People of Color – especially Natives – performing for the pleasure of a rich White person dressed as Buffalo Bill was just too obviously exploitive. The Buffalo Bill cameo was cut from the OSF production.

That discussion was the seed for this project. Just because Buffalo Bill never appeared on stage did not mean that the exploitive dynamic did not exist, especially at a theatre like OSF which has put a great effort into hiring artists of color, but whose audience base is principally wealthy and White (Rauch et al.).

Or is it? At the opening of *Off the Rails*, there were far more Natives in the audience than I am used to seeing at the theatre. During the Round Dance at the end of the play, the cast asked if any audience members would like to come on stage and join them – but specified that they could accommodate only a handful of extra people on stage. Native elders flowed down the aisles of the Angus Bowmer to join in the dance. There was more than a handful, but what were the actors going to do, turn them away? What we had created was apparently deeply rewarding and meaningful for Natives in the audience.

A paradox emerged for me as a theatre practitioner in my work on *Off the Rails*. On one hand, theatre can be deeply exploitive, literally restaging Buffalo Bill's exhibitions of Indians. On the other hand, it can be an empowering experience to not only see yourself on stage but to be on stage as well. This dissertation is an exercise in untangling that paradox. Representation of races other than White seems to be important. Anecdotally, and from my own experiences as a theatre professional and audience member, representation does seem to have some bearing on audience demographics. While watching plays for this dissertation, I noticed that community-focused theatres like Golden Thread Productions in San Francisco, Native Voices and East West Players, both in Los Angeles, drew half to a majority of the audiences of which I was a member from their key communities (Middle Eastern Americans at Golden Thread, Natives at Native Voices, and Asian Americans at East West Players). Separate from this project, I noticed that the audience at *Ain't No Mo'* at The Public in New York City appeared to be about half People of Color. Unlike Golden Thread, Native Voices or East West Players, The Public does not have an explicit community focus, which implies that their target

audience is the dominant group (Billig 17). In the United States, where social power is racially coded, that dominant group is White, indicating that it might be the actors and not the theatre that attracts audiences of color.

Perhaps, instead, audience demographics correlates with local demographics? Ashland, Oregon is overwhelmingly White (92%, according to the 2019 American Community Survey 5-year estimate). In San Francisco that proportion is 46%, in Los Angeles it is 52% and in New York City it is 43%. However, this reason does not stand up to scrutiny – Ashland, San Francisco and New York are all tourist destinations. Their local demographics cannot sufficiently explain the demographics of their theatre audiences.

The question that is emerging is, why is theatre so White? And, when it is not, why not? Is it the result of exclusionary hiring process, or exclusionary residential patterns, or another reason that can be directly addressed, or does it lie deeper in the very DNA of the medium itself? In other words, is theatre incidentally or fundamentally White? If it is only incidentally White, then theatres like the Oregon Shakespeare Festival, Golden Thread Productions, and The Public are effectively resisting White hegemony with plays like *Off the Rails*, *Scenes from 71* Years*, and *Ain't No Mo'*. If theatre is fundamentally White, then the opportunities provided by those plays are positives for the people who actually got the jobs and were integrated into the theatre industry (at least for the duration of those productions) but do little to nothing to ameliorate the White hegemony that has been historically established in the United States. A stronger approach to answering the question of why theatre audiences are so White and, when they are not, why they are not, is through understanding the role of

White habitus in arts participation. When developing Pierre Bourdieu's notion of habitus to more fully account for race, Eduardo Bonilla-Silva defines White habitus as a "racialized, uninterrupted socialization process that conditions and creates whites' racial tastes, perceptions, feelings, and emotions and their views on racial matters." (Bonilla-Silva 2013 [2003], 124). Regional racial formation is also important to what follows: as Laura Pulido explains, "racial hierarchies are experienced at the regional and local levels" even though they fit, conceptually, into macro structures at the national level (xiv). The region that best encompasses three of the locations named above – Ashland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles – is defined by the historic event of the California Gold Rush. This dissertation locates its focus on what I am calling "the Gold Rush zone" (or "GRZ" for short), which includes the entirety of the State of California as well as Curry, Josephine, and Jackson Counties in Oregon. By event, I mean one of those "relatively rare subclass of happenings that significantly [transform] structures" (Sewell, Chapter 3), where structures are "sets of mutually sustaining schemas and resources that empower and constrain social action and that tend to be reproduced by that social action (Sewell, Chapter 4). Structures are similar to habitus except that Sewell allows for greater agency by participants in structures than Bourdieu does for participants in habitus.

I approach White habitus as an undesirable outcome because of the boundaries it creates for nonwhites. As a Native theatre practitioner – both in the sense that I am an artist who works in Native theatre and an enrolled Karuk who practices theatre – I am drawn to settler-colonial theory and critiques as ways to assess hegemonic Whiteness. This project will conclude with a platform of policy recommendations with an eye towards dismantling hegemonic Whiteness in theatre.

Literature Review

This project begins with the premise that theatre acts as an auxiliary of state power, whether or not the theatre creators intend it to. This thesis dates back to European antiquity but that has been significantly developed since the 1970s. Augusto Boal develops earlier Greek theories on this theme in his *Theatre of the Oppressed* (originally published in Spanish as *Teatro de Oprimido* in 1974). Boal begins his book by tracing a genealogy of an ancient Greek conception of art and nature. He begins with a survey of the Presocratic search for the underlying element of nature, then gives a brief account of Plato's theory of *logos*, or *a priori* forms. He proceeds to Aristotle's *Poetics* and *Nicomachean Ethics* begins with the Aristotle's definition of mimesis as "re-creation."

(1) This supposes a binary between technology (be it as art or as science) and nature. The purpose of technology is to improve upon nature, so *mimesis* in theatre is meant to show an idealized politics, which Aristotle (in Boal) is the "highest good" since the purpose of politics is to legalize "justice". (21) This idealization of politics acts coercively upon the audience through their empathy with the protagonist, a virtuous character with one fatal flaw, or *hamartia*. The *hamartia* is a vice in the protagonist's character that has allowed him or her to achieve happiness, but also precipitates their *peripeteia*, or radical shift in fortunes. Boal proceeds with a brief assessment of the shift from feudal to bourgeois theatre concomitant with the same political shift in Europe. This precipitated a shift in morality where legitimate power did not descend from God (or from the gods), but instead emanated from the wealthy man's *virtù*, or an economizing personality that promoted economic success (61). Shakespeare is the primary playwright to address this

shift through “multidimensional” considerations of his protagonists, reflecting the bourgeois internalization of virtue (64). Boal conceives of state power as class dominance through legalism, and of theatre’s function within that as justifying the morality of that class dominance.

While not a theatrical or performance studies text, Michel Foucault’s *Discipline and Punish* (1975) has had a definite impact on analyses of the relationship between theatre and the state. Foucault traces a history from highly theatricalized forms of punishment, in which the condemned is both protagonized and purged of that which interferes with the state in a manner reminiscent of Boal’s reading of Aristotle, to a state in which punishment is generalized and institutionalized as per Alexandr Solzhenitsyn’s *Gulag Archipelago* (1973). Where the disciplinary function that Boal observes comes through the audience members seeing themselves in the protagonist, discipline in Foucault comes through the disappearance of antistate actors. Foucault begins with a gruesome description of an 18th century execution and ends with a list of characteristics belonging to a “carceral archipelago” (298). The despectacularization of punishment is accompanied by heightened visibility of the population, illustrated here with Jeremy Bentham’s *Panopticon* (1787). Differing from the Greek amphitheater, which segregates a society between surveyors and surveilled, a panoptic method of surveillance casts everyone as potentially either, recalling Boal’s disintegration of the audience/actor binary in his own dramaturgical practice.

Diana Taylor, in her *Disappearing Acts* (1997) applies these theories of archipelagic systems of power to the state sponsored violence in Argentina during their

so-called “Dirty War”¹. Taylor’s conception of state power is rooted in the brutal violence of the Argentine Junta. That state operated through a combination of ideological definition of what meant to be Argentinian, and ruthless terror against those within the nation’s borders who were not represented by that definition. Whereas Boal has a class-based approach to understanding state power, Taylor understands the state both through the lenses of nationalism and misogyny. The feminist reading she adds to Foucault’s theories by emphasizing the ways in which the aggressors cast themselves as military males, and how they cast their victims as effeminate. She also highlights the ways in which sexual violence is used as a tool of state control in carceral archipelagos like the ones Solzhenitsyn and Foucault describe. In doing so, she exposes an error in Foucault’s presumption of equal chances in surveillance: state-sponsored violence in Argentina relied on the construction of a predatory in-group and a hunted out-group. As Boal notes, in Aristotle inequality is an empirical phenomenon based on state structure, and so any political performance (and all performance is political) will be based on those objective, legal inequalities (Boal 23). Theatre and performance operate as both enablers of state terror and as responses to it. With regards to enablers, Taylor profiles both the theatricality of punitive measures against the state’s enemies as well as plays that replicate the misogyny inherent to Argentina’s violence. With regards to responders to state violence, she coins the “witnessing”, as an antidote to the disappearances enacted by the Argentinian state. Since state power operates through a carceral archipelago which erases its victims from sight, a powerful mode of resistance is to make those victims

¹ I hesitate to use that term, however, ever since an Argentinian colleague corrected me by emphatically stating that not even the most right-wing radio pundits in Argentina would unhesitatingly call what happened then a “war”.

visible again. Taylor writes about the Madres de Plaza de Mayo who used fascist understanding of femininity to reverse the disappearances that the government had affected on their children by assembling publicly, dressed in white head scarves, and bearing pictures of their lost children. Their performance is significant to Taylor because, while it resisted the most aggressive and urgent depredations of the Junta, it did so by reifying some of the imagery upon which the regime justified itself.

Julie Holledge and Joanne Tompkins develop the focus on gender, but with reference to performance that blurs national boundaries in their *Women's Intercultural Performance* (2000). Intercultural performance is rooted in Western subject in that it “is complicit with a postmodern licence to borrow theatrical techniques from different cultures (both in the west and beyond) within a western defined global and theatre practice” (2). The implication here is that intercultural theatre is a product of Western imperialism, and their project is to explore the role of women within what is typically a patriarchal process. The negotiations with patriarchy are clearest in their treatment of productions of *Antigone* and *A Doll's House*. These two plays explicitly pit a woman against a patriarchal state (19), but in their appropriation by theatre practitioners outside of the West productions of these plays reify the universalizing tendencies of Western feminism (18). Since their study revolves around imperialism, their chapter on performances by Indigenous subjects of empire is perhaps the most telling. They include two case studies of Indigenous ceremony – a Korean shamanic ceremony performed in Australia and the United States, and a Warlpiri ceremony performed in Australia. The Korean ceremony, performed by Kim Kum hwa, was packaged for performances in mainstream Australian and American performance centers through a 75-minute time-

limit (63) and exoticizing publicity photos. It was negatively received by Korean American audiences in Knoxville, who walked out of the theatre. However, Australian audiences with “a classical western view of ritual” engaged positively with Kim Kum hwa’s work. The authors’ second case study concerns the use of a Warlpiri ceremony for White Australians – the Warlpiri are one of the peoples colonized by Australia. Holledge and Tompkins class these performances as “performance in the service of the state” (74). They identify an anxiety over lack of national identity in Australia, an anxiety which is salved through Indigenous appropriation. From the perspective of early Warlpiri performers for Australian audiences, however, these performances act as a way to protect their ritual objects (77). Similar to the Madres de Plaza de Mayo, the Warlpiri performers strike a devil’s bargain in their cultural displays for Australian settlers – in taking a positive action for the preservation and protection of their community, they are forced to make concessions to the group who has demonstrated its ability to unleash genocidal violence upon them. While Holledge and Tompkins study power as invested in global empire (centered, albeit, in the West) instead of the strictly national power studied by Taylor, the roots of that power seem to be propensity towards genocide. Under such conditions, even theatre or performance that resists homicidal power cannot resist it entirely: the theatre or performance must pick and choose which aspects of power to resist and which to accept.

Maureen McDonnell’s 2008 chapter on an Australian production of *As You Like It* featuring Aboriginal actors as Rosalind and the exiled Duke develops the theme of multicultural performance always being to the benefit of the Western, White, settler class. The production happened in 1999, a year that McDonnell marks with indicators of

positive inclusion of Aboriginal Australians and Torres Straight Islanders into Australian notions of “multiculturalism”. However, McDonnell highlights the compromising nature of this inclusion. She cites Australia’s virulent history of violence against Indigenous Peoples, and how multiculturalism was initially conceived as excluding Indigenous Peoples in favor of immigrants of color. She also highlights the cultural perceptions that affect incorporation of Indigenous faces into productions of Shakespeare. These perceptions center on White normativity which allows a few Aboriginal actors to be de-individualized and to stand in for all Indigenous Australians, whereas White bodies are perceived as individuals. This is on account of theater’s largely White audiences. The effect is twofold: first, Aboriginal actors use Shakespeare as a way to be seen by Whites and to demonstrate competency within settler society not just for themselves, but also in a way that argues for incorporation of indigenous peoples into Australian practices of multiculturalism. Second, it allows White audiences to claim Aboriginals within their own systems to assuage anxieties relating to the violent settlement of Australia and to claim aboriginality along with Aboriginals, i.e., to legitimize settler claims to Aboriginal land.

Jisha Menon develops the relationship between empire and its subjects, even when those subjects have experienced decolonization. Her *The Performance of Nationalism* (2013) engages with theatre, performance, and film studies to critique the current relationship between India, Pakistan and Bangladesh and the idea of nationalism. Her book proceeds from the premise that the idea of the nation itself is an imperial construct and that in attempting to construct postcolonial nations, former imperial subjects have no choice but to mimic logics of empire. She begins her study with a look

at the Beating Retreat Ceremony on the India-Pakistan border that regularly occurs to indicate the unavailability of border crossing between the two nations. It involves not only displays of martial masculinity by representatives of each nation's military, but also, on the Indian side where she observed the performance, jingoistic displays by Hindu nationalists. She also observes that the train slows as it approaches the border, telescoping one's perception of distance from the station to the frontier (37). The entire performance is part of establishing the border drawn by British agents before they decamped from South Asia. This case study lays the groundwork for the succeeding studies of plays and movies that all negotiate what it means to be Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, or Kashmiri. By framing her argument as such, she clarifies that all such negotiations reify British territorial definitions in South Asia.

Rustom Bharucha's *Terror and Performance* (2016) develops postmodern theory (this time by Derrida) to show how performances that reject imperial borders are terroristic. Fundamental to his project is delinking "terror" and "terrorism". For Bharucha, terror is both a visceral state of being and an adjectival quality. The former use is related to falling from a great height (11), while the latter is more closely aligned with political designations of terrorism in that it refers to "being terrible" (9), or outside the limits of correct behavior. Because of the cultural attention given to terrorism, that second, moral definition takes precedence. Terrorism is thematically linked to Derridean rogues, most pointedly here in citing Saddam Hussein's pejorative appellation as "the beast of Baghdad" (6). The apocalyptic connotations here are not by accident – as in Plato, subjects acting outside the law threaten the very ontology of the state. Part of this threat is in a performative mastery of symbols: "Terrorists are effective precisely because

they infiltrate security zones with all the performative accoutrements of 'normal' behaviour, circumventing the protocols of surveillance" (72). In other words, terrorists can "pass" as something they are not, just as an actor can. The terror they disseminate, then, is not in the violence – after all, over saturation with images of violence leads to desensitization to it. Rather, the terror comes from demonstrating the insufficiency of the state's technology of Foucauldian knowledge, and thus the state's permeability. This sense of the state, then, is rooted both in Foucault's understanding of individualized surveillance and in Menon's emphasis on the importance of frontiers.

In some cases, performances by those exercising hegemonic power can stand in lieu of restrictive laws. Steven Hoelscher addresses how performance was used to enact social closures and segregation in the Jim Crow South. His 2002 study of the Natchez Pilgrimage focuses on that event up to the Civil Rights Movement. Hoelscher uses a qualitative exploration of archival materials and ethnographic fieldnotes to explore how racial segregation in Natchez, Mississippi was maintained through public performance with limited Jim Crow laws. Between Reconstruction and the Civil Rights Movement, Natchez's segregation was remarkably underlegislated. Instead, Hoelscher argues, Natchez whites claimed landscapes through performance. He focuses on the annual Natchez Pilgrimage in which White locals and tourists were treated to antebellum reenactments in the historic plantation houses. This theater was driven by the female Natchez Garden Club, who performed White femininity as domestic and hospitable. Hoelscher adds to the discussion of mnemonic claims to space by performance groups by introducing Pierre Nora's theory of *lieux de mémoire*. Nora introduced his theory in 1989 to describe affective and nostalgic relationships with place. Nora first differentiates

between memory and history. For Nora, memory is associated with oral peasant cultures, and hence lived immediacy. History is removed from the everyday – it is archival, and a thing to be visited but not dwelt within. *Lieux de mémoire* are historical sites meant to activate nostalgia in place of a lived memory. These sites can be documents or, which is more germane here, actual geographic sites. The Natchez Spring Pilgrimage is meant to activate nostalgia by giving tourists a glimpse of a location in such a way that it would evoke positive feelings of nostalgia. These geographic sites were plantation houses. Integral to this nostalgia was the denial of the horrors committed within the antebellum regime against enslaved Blacks. This meant that the Natchez Garden Club advocated and sometimes enforced a Whites-only attendance policy, and those whites that did attend needed to be on board with the project of antebellum nostalgia. So, no Freedom Riders or any of their ilk were allowed. In other words, threats to nostalgia are excluded. Contrary to Aristotle, Hoelscher understands the state not as a body of laws but rather as a selective process of remembering.

Hoelscher understands the Natchez Pilgrimage as enforcing White power by activating affective imagery about the 19th century. John W. Frick (2007) looks to the 19th century to understand the ways in which theatre used affect to enforce morality, especially around issues like temperance and abolition. He does so by framing what he terms “moral reform melodramas” like *The Drunkard* and *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* within their corresponding activist movements. This method is similar to mine in its understanding that the play does not stop at the theatre walls. Rather, the theatre – specifically in its choice of plays – engages in conversations and conflicts that its workers and audiences engage in when they are in other locations. Hence, it is insufficient to

consider *The Drunkard* on its own and not as it corresponds to the temperance movement. The same applies to *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, except that that play existed as part of the movement to abolish Black slavery.

Amy E. Hughes (2012) develops that argument with case studies of *The Drunkard*, *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and *Under the Gaslight* as they contributed to their corresponding activist movements. While Frick's article-length study cannot go much further than describing *The Drunkard* and *Uncle Tom's Cabin* as "propaganda" for their respective movements, Hughes is able to describe how they propagated their messages in her book. She relies heavily on French postmodern theory – Debord, Baudrillard, and especially Foucault – to show how "spectacle" is used to establish normalcy (the modern notion of which emerged in the 19th century). Her study participates in feminist, queer and especially disability studies in her argument that displaying a human body as abnormal enforces community understanding of what it means to be normal (8). She focuses on prominent images of human bodies in extreme situations in the three plays – the *delirium tremens* in *The Drunkard*, Eliza crossing the ice in *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and the male protagonist tied to the railroad tracks in *Under the Gaslight* – and how those images appeared elsewhere in contemporary American society.

Across this literature, the notion of the state is understood as primarily an ideological project that promotes the continued dominance of whichever group has most access to coercive power. Besides Boal, who takes a Marxist class-based approach, the general consensus seems to be that the dominant group worldwide is either Whites or, for Holledge and Tompkins, the West. Scholars tend to use either one or the other term, but based on their usage they seem to be coterminous. As an ideological or ethical project,

the state seems to rely more heavily on cultural happenings than it does on laws – in order for laws to exist, a certain number of people need to believe that those laws, and the society they describe, are just and good. In this way, research into theatre, film and other performance is critical to understanding the constitution of states. Part of that research is sociological. The founding father of this line of research is Pierre Bourdieu. His *Distinction* (1984) is based upon “a survey by questionnaire, carried out in 1963 and 1967-8, on a sample of 1,217 people” to learn about their tastes with regards to “cultural goods consumed” (13). Through this study, Bourdieu is able to link tastes to “educational capital” and “social origin”, and that “at equivalent levels of educational capital, the weight of social origin in the practice- and preference-explaining system increases as one moves away from the most legitimate areas of culture.” He begins his study with “a preliminary survey by extended interview and ethnographic analysis” (503), and followed up the 1963 survey in 1967-8 in order to expand his original sample size. His analysis harks to Marx in its privileging of class in social hierarchy. Sex is important, but takes second place to class. Race is barely touched upon. As such, *Distinction* is an anthropology of French classes, defined by profession and excluding farmers and farm workers since the cultural touchstones referenced in his study were largely out of their universe. Through this anthropology, Bourdieu develops his notions of social space and habitus. Social space is “the system of objective relations within which positions and postures are defined relationally and which governs even those struggles aimed at transforming it” (156). Habitus are the set of rules by which the game of social space is played – they are “the internalized form of class condition and of the conditionings it entails” (101). *Distinction* is notable not only for the methodological theories Bourdieu

develops, but also for its self-reflexivity. He acknowledges the role that academia has in producing legitimate culture, that is, culture which can translate into social status or power, and that the terms by which academic inquiry is conducted, i.e. measurement tools and methods, “are weapons and prizes in the struggle between the classes...” (245). With regards to theatre, Bourdieu looks at the ways in which different indicators of cultural capital track with different fractions of the dominant class, indicated by professional groupings (118). In describing the ways in which members of professions like doctors and lawyers educate their children, Bourdieu shows how cultural capital is exchanged for social capital: “in cultural practices which symbolize possession of the material and cultural means of maintaining a bourgeois life-style and which provide a social capital, a capital of social connections, honourability and respectability that is often essential in winning and keeping the confidence of high society, and with it a clientele, and may be drawn on, for example, in making a political career” (122). In other words, spending economic capital on going to the theatre is meant to provide cultural capital which is meant to confer social capital which can then be parlayed back into economic capital.

Subsequent research continues to clarify this relationship between theatre and power. In 1994-1995, Tony Bennett, Michael Emmison and John Frow conducted a large-scale survey ($n = 2,756$), based upon Bourdieu’s study for *Distinction*, in Australia. This survey is the subject of their 1999 book *Accounting for Tastes: Australian Everyday Cultures*. One of the conclusions they reach is “that increased education tends to go with an increased interest in a *range* of activities (and, conversely, that lower levels of education predict a narrower range in all areas); and that, in this context, it makes sense

to think of the sociocultural space as being organised by a distinction between inclusive and restricted forms of practice, rather than by one between ‘high’ (or ‘legitimate’) and ‘low’ (or ‘popular’) practices” (116, emphasis in original). This follows Bourdieu’s emphasis on academia as a source of cultural capital, but rephrases the distinction from one between “high” and “low” culture (which correspond to “high” and “low” class) to one between inclusive and restricted culture (emphasizing the more omnivorous tastes of those with higher degrees of educational capital).

In 2003, Henk Gras, Philip Hans Franses and Marius Ooms supplement this data indicating more omnivorous tastes on the part of higher classes. They research the Rotterdam theatre archives to test a proposition received from Dutch theatre historiography: that in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, “men of taste and civilization” claimed the theatres from the “rabble.” Using a longitudinal analysis factoring in numbers of seats sold at particular prices with the types of plays at which those tickets were sold, Gras et al. for the most part reject the “recovery” narrative of Dutch theatre historiography (638). While the quantity of “first-rate spectators” did increase after 1875, this increase made little to no difference with regards to theatre repertoire (639).

None of this empirical work develops any strong claims about race, even while Bennett et al. do describe some characteristics of Aboriginal taste. That is not to say, however, that race is tangential to taste. Eduardo Bonilla-Silva introduced the concept of “white habitus” in his 2003 *Racism without Racists* in which he describes “color-blind racism” based upon interview data from the 1997 Survey of Social Attitudes of College Students and the 1998 Detroit Area Study on White Racial Ideology. The thesis of his

chapter six, “Peeking Inside the (White) House of Color Blindness” is that “high levels of social and spatial segregation and isolation from minorities creates what I label as a ‘white *habitus*,’ a racialized, uninterrupted socialization process that *conditions* and *creates* whites’ racial taste, perception, feelings, and emotions and their views on racial matters” (124, emphases in original). Indicators of White *habitus* include an error of positive self-representation in the ways in which the respondents underplay their racially homogenous social behavior, that they “did not interpret their hypersegregation from blacks as a problem, because they did not interpret this as a *racial* phenomenon” (130), and that Whites “are more likely to oppose interracial marriage than any other form of interracial association.” (133) These traits are caused by self-segregation – homogeneously white communities are integral to the maintenance of white *habitus*. In a 2006 article titled “When Whites Flock Together: The Social Psychology of White *Habitus*” with Carla Goar and David G. Embrick, Bonilla-Silva develops this theory by, first, giving a clearer introduction to Bourdieu’s theory and, second, making clearer the in-group/out-group dynamic here. The authors claim that racial *habitus* predicated by homogenous residential patterns “creates in-group and out-group dichotomies. Because there is a tendency to treat individual members of an out-group as a unified social category (‘All blacks are...’ ‘All women are...’), interactions may be based on group membership rather than individual identity...” (232). The impact of in-group hegemony on perceiving homogeneity within an out-group will be useful below in considering stagings of minority races for predominantly White audiences.

Argument and Methodology

This literature indicates a global view of the state and White supremacy. This view from space, as it were, is not feasible. While they do not provide clear rationale, each scholar focuses on one geographic region, or at least one geographic reason at a time. In doing so, they usually provide some background information about the history of power structures in that region. Laura Pulido, in her *Black, Brown, Yellow and Left* (2006) helps us understand why: in considering her choice to study Los Angeles rather than the United States as a whole, she writes that “although all of the United States is informed by a national racial narrative, class structures and racial divisions of labor take shape and racial hierarchies are experienced at the regional and local levels. Because the United States is so large and diverse, it is primarily at the regional level that nuanced and meaningful comparison must take place” (xiv). The focal point of regions is the labor market. These “are significant not only because they are fundamental to the process of class formation but because they are primarily regional and local phenomena. Most people commute to home and work on a daily basis, so this activity sets the potential geographic parameters of labor markets and divisions of labor” (xxxi).

In choosing the region for this project I took into account a region I am intimately familiar with. While I grew up for 16 years in Springfield, Oregon, and primarily wrote this dissertation in Eugene, my family moved to Ashland, Oregon when I was in high school to be closer to my mother’s side of the family, whose roots are in southern Oregon and northern California. On her father’s side, my mother is Karuk from the villages of Ka’tim’iin (near current-day Somes Bar, California) and Taxasúfkara (within current-day Orleans, California) on the Klamath River (in local parlance, simply “the River”). On her

mother's side, my mother is descended from White emigrants primarily from Iowa who settled in Ashland. Since high school, I have returned to Ashland innumerable times to visit family and to work at theatres there. I continue to go the River for tribal ceremonies during the summer and to visit my sister, who married into a Yurok family and lives on the Yurok Reservation downriver from Ka'tim'ïin and Taxasúfkara. Because of my intimate familiarity with the Medford Metropolitan Area and the River, this area was the best starting place for defining my region of analysis.

The above scholars do not just take a limited regional frame, they also take a temporal frame. A popular option is the present moment of their writing, and that is no different here. I am seeking to understand hegemonic Whiteness in the theatre industry within which I work. There is also a strong component of historical analysis, even in studies where the focal point is the writer's present. For example, Menon could reach no clear understand of the performance of nationalism in 2013 South Asia without considering the historic event of Partition. The idea of a restructuring event to which future generations must refer to make sense of their present is developed by William H. Sewell, Jr. in his *Logics of History* (2005), where he argues for studying "eventful historical sociology". This comprises historical and sociological analyses that address both structures and events. Structures are sets "of mutually sustaining schemas and resources that empower and constrain social action and that tend to be reproduced by that social action." (Chapter 4: A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation; subheading "The Transformation of Dual Structures: Out of Bourdieu's Habitus") They can be described by Bourdieu's notion of habitus. (Chapter 4) Structures are disrupted and changed by events, or

sequences of occurrences that result in transformations of structures. Such sequences begin with a rupture of some kind - that is, a surprising break with routine practice. Such breaks actually occur every day - as a consequence of exogenous causes, of contradictions between structures, of sheer human inventiveness or perversity, or of simple mistakes in enacting routines. But most ruptures are neutralized and reabsorbed into the preexisting structures in one way or another - they may, for example, be forcefully repressed, pointedly ignored, or explained away as exceptions. But whatever the nature of the initial rupture, an occurrence becomes a historical event, in the sense in which I use the term, when it touches off a chain of occurrences that durably transforms previous structures and practices. (Chapter 8: Historical Events as Transformations of Structures: Inventing Revolution at the Bastille, subheading “Events as a Theoretical Category”)

Somewhat in Jackson County (especially Jacksonville) and quite certainly on the River, the California Gold Rush looms large as one such event. While the United States gained legal control of both Oregon and California prior to the discovery of gold in the American River in late 1848, the massive incursion of Americans as well as immigrants from around the globe proved both catastrophic for Karuk society and formative for American society in the region. While gold was primarily mined in the Siskiyou (along the California-Oregon border), the Sierra Nevada and the San Joaquin Mountains, the settler population boom was most concentrated in San Francisco. Emigrant routes came across the Panama Isthmus and up the Pacific to San Francisco, down from Oregon, across the Sierra Nevadas, and through the Mojave desert to San Bernardino. Southern California was not fully incorporated into the cultural life of the region until its population boom during World War II. The GRZ consists of both the current U. S. state of California as well as several Oregon counties along the California border (Curry, Josephine, and Jackson). Southern California is included here for a couple reasons. The first is that its culture emphasizes Anglo-Saxon experiences, although its Anglicizing event happened later than northern California and southern Oregon. The second, stronger

reason relies on Pulido's above understanding of regions being defined by labor markets. Los Angeles is the hub of the entertainment workforce on the West Coast, comparable to New York's centrality on the East Coast. It is also the home of Native Voices at the Autry. American theatre professionals with whom I work (and I myself) seem to be semi-itinerate. We establish a home base where we can make the most money or – if we can get enough work on the road – someplace nice where we would like to live. However, it is important that we be ready to pull up stakes, sometimes for several months, to be able to take a job up the coast or across the country. While important to the American theatre labor market, New York is too far away from the California Gold Rush to be included in its Zone. While Mexican culture was more resilient in southern California than in San Francisco, it was the point of arrival for overland emigrants during the winter. I include it in this study, but its importance only becomes clear after World War II.

The question, then, that this research addresses is – to what degree does the racializing event of the California Gold Rush continue to impact Gold Rush Zone theatre today? If it does, then the Whiteness that exists in GRZ theatre today is a product of racial structures – it is fundamental, and the best that Indigenous Peoples and other People of Color can hope for within it is integration. If it does not, then the Whiteness that currently exists in GRZ is incidental and its remedies, while they may take hard work, are simply things like expanding the labor pool or the target audience – things that theatres like OSF and Golden Thread Productions are currently doing.

This project, then, relies on a historical comparison between the Gold Rush and the present of writing. The Gold Rush, here, is defined as the period between 1849 and 1860. While the heady early days of the Gold Rush were over by 1855, 1860 stands as an

important date in conducting demographic research because of the decennial Census. The present moment of writing is the theatre season of 2018 to 2019². It was during this year that I conducted the bulk of my field work in seeing plays at OSF, Golden Thread Productions, East West Players, and Native Voices at the Autry.

Implicit to my understanding of this time and place is Jack Norton's argument that genocide, by the United Nations' definition, was perpetrated against us. This argument, in both his book *Genocide in Northwestern California: When Our Worlds Cried* and his subsequent essay "The Democratization of Genocide", published as the first chapter in his *Centering in Two Worlds*, provide academic justifications for my sense of my place as a Karuk person in American society. Norton has two methodological agendas in these works. The first is in common with other revisionist California historians, beginning with Robert F. Heizer and Alan J. Amquist's *The Other Californians*, which sets the tone for much of the literature to come after them. They, like Norton, rely heavily on primary documents – in fact, their own prose serves essentially as a contextualizing frame for the newspaper clippings and other archival documents that they found that give first-hand accounts of how non-White races and ethnicities were perceived by Gold Rush Whites. Norton's other methodological agenda, which this dissertation shares, is that it motivates for immediate change. The change for which Norton writes is accountability on the part of the American citizenry and their government for the horrors perpetrated against Indian peoples; the changes for which I motivate are a humbler set of alterations to the theatre industry.

² Most not-for-profit theatres operate seasonally – they decide on a slate of plays ahead of time and produce them over the course of several months. Most theatres operate from fall through spring, while a few like the Oregon Shakespeare Festival operate from spring through fall.

Heizer and Almquist also lay the groundwork for the differential racialization that is used later by Tomás Almaguer and formalized by Laura Pulido. Like *Other Californians*, Almaguer's *Racial Faultlines* and Pulido's *Black, Brown, Yellow and Left* demonstrate the different ways in which non-White racial groups interface with Whites and with each other. As such, they reject the Black-White binary implicit in classic critical race theory like Omi & Winant's *Racial Formation in the United States* in favor of a triangular imagery of the way that race positions individuals in relationship to each other. They are joined by Evelyn Nakano Glenn in her article "Settler Colonialism as Structure: A Framework for Comparative Studies of U.S. Race and Gender Formation" which argues that White settlers used a common set of tools like "containment", "erasure", "terror", and "removal" to differently race Indians, Latin Americans, Blacks, and Asians. James V. Fenelon critiques Glenn (and might critique Almaguer, Heizer and Almquist) for focusing upon race. Instead of understanding conquest in the Americas as a process of racialization, Fenelon argues that the focus ought to be on colonialism itself: "this expansion must identify colonizers and states as perpetrators of genocidal conquest, and Native Nations (not racialized Indians) as resisting invasion and domination, decolonizing and revitalizing Indigenous cultures in opposition to neoliberal modernisms" (237). This argument will be developed in Chapter II of this dissertation, in which I will describe the binary that White settlers attempted to draw between themselves and the "savage" tribal nations of what is currently California and southern Oregon. This basic grammar of racial difference, which was used to justify that period's genocide,

informed the ways other White and non-White groups were socially situated in terms of the dominant Anglo-Saxon group.

This dissertation represents an attempt to draw these discourses around differential racialization and tribal sovereignty into the theatre studies field. Current exegeses and histories of the theatre of racialized groups like those of Michael Malek Najjar (concerning Arab American theatre), Karen Shimakawa (concerning Asian-American theatre), and Yvette Nolan (concerning First Nations theatre) focuses their discourses differently than the theoretical literature mentioned above. First, they largely depict a binary where Arab Americans, Asian-Americans, or First Nations are creating theatre in response and resistance to White theatre and political establishments. They also eschew the tight regionalism used by Heizer and Almquist, Norton, Almaguer, and Pulido to consider their racialized group of interest nationally. My project here is both broader and more restricted than similar theatre studies work. It is broader in that I am considering the theatre of several racialized groups all of whose work is in conversation with each other's. This means, a play like *Off the Rails* does not just exist within a Native-White binary, but also exists in relationship to – for instance – Black communities and their theatre. It is more restrictive in that I follow the leads of Heizer and Almquist, Norton, Almaguer, and Pulido by tightening my regional focus to a sub-national level.

Since this dissertation concerns race and ethnicity, some space needs to be given here to clarify my use of terminology. With regards to the difference between race and ethnicity, it serves to note that both are historic ways to understand and enforce social difference. Race developed as a concept that emphasized biological difference, to the extent of taxonomizing *Homo sapiens* and speculating that some races constituted an

intermediary between humans and other great apes, while ethnicity was conceived of as primarily cultural (Omi & Winant 15). In the 19th century GRZ, races were broadly understood to comprise Whites, Blacks, Indians, Pacific Islanders (then called by the now-pejorative Kanaka) and Asians. Within Whiteness, ethnicity was broadly conceived of along linguistic lines – the four identified in my research being Anglo-Saxons, Germans, French and “Spanish”. This last included not only natives of Spain but also Latin Americans. They presented a quandary for Californian lawmakers because this group included both White and Indian members. During the current period, I rely on census designations, the races of which are White, Black, Asian, American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. Hispanic is listed in the census as an ethnicity. However, as I demonstrate later, this group is often racialized. This, as well as Gold Rush thinkers describing White ethnic groups as “races”, leads me to align my language more with Pulido’s mutability between the terms because “racial groups may also function as ethnic groups” (xxiv) than with Omi and Winant’s more precise understanding. While many scholars do not capitalize “White”, I do for the sake of consistency. With regards to my own race, I insist on using word “Indian”, which is falling out of favor in polite society but continues to be used within my community. My understanding is that, especially among Canadian First Nations, the term has become pejorative. My use of it is an insistence on maintaining regional colloquialisms as a means of self-definition.

While the early parts of this study focus entirely on one time period or the other, the later part comprises the comparative work. This comparison is done using Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA). QCA presents a “‘third’ way to conduct social science

research that combines the strengths of traditional quantitative and qualitative methods” (Devers et al. 1). The preponderance of the research on theatre as an auxiliary of state power relies on qualitative research that focuses on close reads of a handful of performances in juxtaposition related cultural materials, and comes from humanities disciplines like theatre and performance studies. Sociological research like that of Bourdieu relies more heavily on quantitative data than the humanities scholars introduced above. Both approaches have their limitations. The restricted focus of qualitative studies is ideal for gaining an in depth understanding of a particular performance like that of the Madres de Plaza de Mayo or text like *The Drunkard*, but provides limited opportunities to make strong claims about the state of performance or theatre in general. Quantitative methods are strong with regards to “linear, additive relationships” but is weaker with regards to understanding sets or “collections of cases of interest.” QCA is designed to approach principally qualitative data from a set-theoretic approach which “analyze the relationships among complex social structures, processes, and outcomes through the notion of sets and their relations...” (Devers et al. 2). Set-theory can be done without a statistical tool when the number of cases is small enough. For example, Hughes describes a set of three play-scripts. However, a larger number of cases is unwieldy for the kind of intuitive work done in the qualitative studies above. Statistical tools that rely on quantitative data, like the surveys done by Bourdieu and Bennett et al., are only useful with a representative sample of the population. The following formula is used to determine minimum sample size:

$$n = \frac{(z^2 * p * q)}{MoE^2}$$

where

n = completed sample size needed for desired level of precision

p = the proportion being tested

$q = 1 - p$

MoE = the desired margin of sampling error

z = the z -score or critical value for the desired level of confidence

(Dillman et al. 78)

To give an example of the kind of sample size that I would need were I to undertake a quantitative study of Gold Rush Zone theatre, Theatre Communications Group (TCG)'s 2018-19 Season Preview (published in *American Theatre's* October 2018 issue) listed 323 productions in the GRZ. With a proportion of 50% and a confidence level of 95%, I would have needed to see 176 of those productions. While this is undoable, a qualitative alternative would be liable to reflecting my own biases and artistic taste with regards to an unrepresentative sample of the 323 productions. It would replicate the methodological blind-spots of a work like Hughes, which tells a lot about *The Drunkard*, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, and *Under the Gaslight* in the context of their respective social movements, but which is liable to critique by pointing out differences between *The Drunkard* and other temperance melodramas, or *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and other abolitionist melodramas. QCA gives me the option of analyzing the similarities and differences between a broader swath of plays than a purely qualitative approach would allow me while freeing me of the need to analyze around 176 productions for each of the 12 years covered by my study.

Chapter Overviews

This dissertation consists of two parts. The first part consists of this chapter, as well as Chapters II and III. The purpose of these three chapters is to lay the groundwork for Chapters IV and V, in which I develop a set of answers to the research question: how does the White hegemony established in the GRZ during the Gold Rush maintain valency in GRZ theatre today?

Chapter II is about racialization in Gold Rush theatre. It works through the racial hierarchy which was developed in the GRZ during the 1850s following the linear structure as which this hierarchy was conceived. It begins with an extended look at Anglo-Saxons and how they positioned themselves as the dominant group in the GRZ. Their mindset is described using primary documents like newspapers, autobiographies, and booster books. Demographic data is initially derived from the 1850 and 1860 censuses, and is expanded upon with secondary sources targeting individual racial and ethnic groups. Last but not least, I rely on scripts of plays that were performed during the Gold Rush. After describing the social maneuvering performed by Anglo-Saxons, I proceed to describe German, French, Latin American, Chinese, Black, Pacific Islander and Indian inhabitants of the GRZ by their social proximity to Anglo-Saxons and representation on stage. For some groups – namely Germans, French, Latin Americans and Chinese – this means both theatre done *by* those communities as well as theatre done *about* them. For the other communities – Black, Pacific Islander and Indian – stage representations were almost exclusively *about* them.

In Chapter III, I provide points of comparison with Chapter II for the purpose of the comparison in Chapter IV. I dispense with the rigid hierarchy of the previous chapter, and adhere closer to the order of races and ethnicities used by the Census. Since White ethnicity has retreated into the private sphere (Avila 28), this chapter begins with an extended exploration of how Whites position themselves as having the greatest engagement with both politics and culture, defined in this chapter as an economic sector comprising endeavors like theatre, film and literature. I then proceed to describe the other

census ethnicity and races by their proximity to Whiteness as well as their representation on stage.

Over the course of Chapters II and III, I identify and briefly analyze a number of plays and performances. In Chapter IV, I review these plays and performances as cases for comparison. I also identify four characteristics of White hegemony in GRZ theatre, which are the outcomes of interest. In describing these outcomes, I also identify conditions that – on the basis of chapters 2 and 3 – seem to have a causal relationship to them. I use fuzzy-set QCA (fsQCA) to sort them in to sets and then reach the analytic moment of this dissertation. I do so first by showing the coded pathways of conditions to each of the outcomes, the absence of each outcome, all of the outcomes together, and the absence of all of the outcomes. I then use these pathways to revisit the analyses of chapters 2 and 3. These analyses lead directly into chapter 5, in which I conclude this dissertation by offering policy recommendations geared towards dismantling White hegemony in GRZ theatre.

CHAPTER II

1849-1860

During the mid-1800s, Whiteness was still in the process of consolidating around self-described “Anglo-Saxons” on the West Coast. This chapter will describe how theatre fit into the incipient Anglo-American hegemony’s project of territorial dominance through a sequence of descriptions of racialized demographic categories with the ways in which they were treated in Gold Rush theatre. It is arranged from Anglo-Saxons through Indians. I am firm that those two categories form the poles of any racial ideology in Gold Rush California. The intermediary groups are arranged to roughly correspond to how many civilized versus savage markers were attributed by the power-holding Anglo class to them. This one-dimensional model reflects what the incipient American hegemony was trying to achieve or construct.

The basic continuum that seems to have existed in Gold Rush Californian Anglo-Saxon conceptions of culture – and, within that, race – was between civilization and savagery. Anglo-Saxons were the prototype of civilization, Indians the prototype of savagery. Racialization was an ongoing project of cementing White hegemony over America’s new land acquisition from the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (Almaguer 3). While rigid racial crystallization was the ideal, its reality as a construct made it mutable, with movement possible either towards civilization or savagery. A White man was supposed to be impulsive and industrious – he had a “go get ‘em” attitude. That impulsiveness could manifest as violence, which, if not strictly regulated, could reduce a white man to a savage. The “Noble Savage” was an Indian whose virtue approached the civilized ideal – and sometimes surpassed the civilization actually practiced by white

people. Perceived sexual availability of women was a marker of savageness: women of color were routinely referred to as licentious. White prostitution and Mormon polygamy, therefore, threatened the bastions of White civilization.

Anglo-Americans established a system of racial differentiation to account for intermediary places on the continuum between civilization and savagery. This concept, as described by Laura Pulido, “denotes that various racial/ethnic groups are racialized in unique ways and have distinct experiences of racism” and that “Particular racial/ethnic groups are associated with particular sets of meanings and economic opportunities, or lack thereof, and these in turn are influenced by groups' history, culture, and national racial narratives and by the regional economy” (Pulido xiv). The boundaries between White ethnic groups like Anglos, Irish, German, Jews, French and fair-complexioned Latin Americans were mutable, as were the boundaries between non-White groups like dark-complexioned Latin Americans, Chinese, Blacks, Pacific Islanders, and Indians, but Anglo-Saxons and local Indians epitomized the two poles of civilization and savagery. While light-skinned residents had access to the legal and extra-legal privileges of Whiteness, those privileges were incumbent upon adherence to Anglo-Saxon cultural norms. Indians could rise out of a state of savagery – and are spectacularly demonstrated doing so in redface³ plays of the day – but not Indians from what was becoming California and southern Oregon. Those Indians were often deemed barely human and better off dead (Heizer & Almquist 28). However, even limited mutability of position on a racialized spectrum posed a problem for the newly dominant Anglo-Saxons. If others could rise, what was stopping them from sinking? They addressed this concern by

³ Plays in which White performs play Indian characters.

approaching capitalism through a form of Protestant millennialism, in which “all human societies eventually progressed to the stage of civilization or else disappeared and served only as reminders of past and inferior worlds. The Christian battle against evil was refigured as a crusade to spread civilization” (Domosh 191). This optimistic view entailed that everybody was going to rise racially, or else die. However, the violence that conquest entailed threatened universal savagery. In effect, their optimism was for universal Anglo-Saxondom, but their fear was of going savage themselves. Theatre was both a location where white people could practice and hence cement civilization, as well as a place that could explore the paradoxes of the racial system they were constructing.

Anglo-Saxons

Since they were in the process of conquering California and southern Oregon, Anglo-Saxons of course positioned themselves as the epicenter of civilization. They saw themselves as inevitable. Soulé et al. frame the Anglicization of California thus: "Indians, Spaniards of many provinces, Hawaiians, Japanese, Chinese, Malays, Tartars and Russians, must all give place to the restless flood of Anglo-Saxon or American progress" (53-54). Anglo-Saxons, during the Gold Rush constituted themselves as what Stephen May calls the “dominant ethnîe” or “*Staatsvolk*”. The dominant ethnîe is, simply, the “majority ethnic group” (13). This numerical definition, however, is insufficient: May later accretes Billig’s theory of “banal nationalism” to it (85). This is the normalization or unquestioning of the dominant ethnîe’s civic and cultural dominance. May also uses the German word *Staatsvolk* to follow Connor in describing “the process by which the dominant ethnic group comes to determine the ‘national essence’ of the nation-state.” Further, “*Staatsvolk* describes a people who are culturally and politically pre-eminent in

the state, even though...other groups may well be present in significant numbers.” This chapter describes this “process” with regards to Anglo-Saxons during the California Gold Rush, and centers on theatre’s utility in ideologically centering Anglo-Saxon identity.

In the next chapter, we will see how non-Anglo-Saxon ethnic groups culturally accreted to them using the designation “White”. While Germans and French are described separately in this chapter, they were still considered White – just not Anglo-Saxon. The Irish were the ethnic group that began this accretion to Anglo-Saxondom in the Gold Rush Zone to create a culturally hegemonic Whiteness. The Irish had a fluid place within Anglo-Saxon identity. Soulé et al. include them with “Americans” and English (488). Wells groups them with English and Scots (300). On the other hand, the *Placerville Mountain Democrat* cites the *New York Tribune* as grouping Irish and Blacks together (“Making Up to the Know Nothings”). California Irish in general, though, seem to have been more aligned with Anglo-Saxons than with Blacks. Even before rapid Americanization, a 1795 Santa Barbara official called Irish settler Joseph O’Cain an “Yngles” or Englishman (Prendergast 12). Blessing has demonstrated that Irish immigration to the United States during the first half of the 19th century consisted of two “streams”: “impoverished peasants” and higher-class residents of the maritime counties on the Irish Sea (xiii). Those “maritime” emigrants were more accustomed to English culture and so had an easier time assimilating in the United States. Their barrier was association with the peasant class, which was associated with Black stereotypes in east coast cities like Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and New Orleans. Since that maritime class predominated in migration to the Far West, and there was no established Anglo-Saxon class already there, California Irish were not demeaned nearly to the same degree

as Irish in the northeast and New Orleans. Where nativist xenophobia might have been directed at the Irish, as per the East and South Coasts, White Californians had a much more visible target in Chinese immigrants. The buffering presence of Chinese immigrants between Irish immigrants and Anglo-Saxon nativists was so pronounced that Burchell goes so far as to claim that “if the Irish had required the degree of success they achieved in [San Francisco], they would have needed to invent the Chinese outsider” (181). The Chinese, unlike the Irish, differed from Anglo-Saxons in “appearance, clothing, hairstyles, accommodation, plays, operas, drugs, family life, language and religion.” Of central importance here is language: Irish (as well as Scots) spoken English as a native language, whereas Chinese (and German and French) emigrants did not.

Prior to the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, the civic languages in what would become the Gold Rush Zone included Spanish in the Mexican-controlled areas along the coast from San Diego to roughly San Francisco, putatively English in southern Oregon, and between 80 and 90 different Indigenous languages (“Languages of California”). American conquest changed that. At first, the English linguistic centers were in the Bay Area as America’s primary access point and the gold fields in the Sierra Nevadas and the Siskiyou. Over the period of 1848-1860, overall Indigenous population decline in California amounted to an estimated 75% (Cook 40). Tribes at Anglo population centers along the lower American River watershed were among the hardest hit, from the perspective of population decline. The Yokuts below the Fresno River lost about 79% of their population by 1858. The Maidu, from the Sierra Nevadas between Lassen Peak and Sierra Valley, lost 71% of their population by 1856. Tribes with less geographic accessibility fared somewhat better. For instance, the Karuk along the mid-

stretch of the Klamath River lost 10% of their population by 1866. The nearby Wiyot, with population centers around Humboldt Bay and the mouth of the Mad River and therefore more accessible to American intrusion, lost about 47% of their population by 1853. The reasons given for this genocide will be given in more detail later in this chapter, but its linguistic upshot was that the English language became the civic language where Anglo-Saxons pooled together in large numbers. “Civic language” here refers to the language in which civic matters like legislation and jurisprudence are conducted (May 326). English was indirectly enforced as the civic language in American population centers through the prohibition against non-whites giving testimony against Whites. This effectively precluded Indigenous languages like Yokuts, Maidu, Karuk, or Wiyot as well as languages of some immigrant minorities like Chinese from being used in a civic context. It did not, however, automatically preclude the use of European languages like German, French or Spanish. German and French speakers do not seem to have put pressure on the court system to use their language, but Spanish speakers did. During California’s constitutional convention in 1849, the eight Mexican delegates (out of 48 delegates total) were able to successfully lobby for a provision that the state legislature print all its laws in Spanish. However, during the economic downturn of the mid-1850s, the 1855 legislature passed a number of bills restricting ethnic and racial minorities. One that was obviously directed at the Spanish-speaking population (which, as we will see, included not only Californios but also immigrants from Mexico, Chile, and Peru), was a refusal to provide funds to translate laws into Spanish. California’s existence as a bilingual state lasted a mere six years, and its monolingualism was part of a

general effort to focus dwindling economic resources towards the Anglo-Saxon power-holding class (Heizer & Almquist 149-151).

Census data from 1850 is incomplete: that Census reports that the returns from San Francisco County were lost in a fire, and those from Contra Costa and Santa Clara Counties were lost in transit to the Census Bureau. From the available records, and including Linn County, Oregon which then represented southern Oregon, the mean number of Whites per county was 3,705. Counties with White populations above that mean were Calaveras (16,802), El Dorado (19,908), Sacramento (8,875), Tuolomne (8,288) and Yuba (9,607). Apparently, the White population of the GRZ was concentrated in Sacramento and the counties in the Sierra Nevadas to the east and northeast. By 1860, the mean White population per county in the GRZ was 6,997. Counties with above average populations of Whites were Alameda (8,548), Amador (8,252), Butte (9,737), Calaveras (12,546), El Dorado (15,515), Los Angeles (9,221), Nevada (14,138), Placer (10,819), Sacramento (21,692), Santa Clara (11,646), San Francisco (52,866), San Joaquin (9,166), Sierra (9,122), Solano (7, 092), Sonoma (11,587), Tuolomne (14,095), and Yuba (11,582). The White population continued to be concentrated in Sacramento and the Sierras east and northeast, but now also in the Bay Area and Los Angeles. In neither census is White ethnicity listed by county.

Theatre partook of the creation of an Anglo-Californian identity through the development of democratic communities. A letter from Captain R. V. Warner of the brig *Isabel* and one of the settlers of Trinidad, CA, included in Wells' *History of Siskiyou County*, lays out a brief chronology of how Trinidad was constituted:

I arrived here to-day in the brig *Isabel*; immediately went on shore and laid out part of a town. I surveyed about ten fifty-vara lots, taking R. A.

Parker's south base line for my north lines and his west lines for my west lines, bordering on the Indian village to the east, and running down to the water. I immediately built a house, erected the American flag some sixty or seventy feet above the hill...Improvements are progressing with the utmost rapidity. Mr. R. A. Parker put up the first house, Mr. Van Wyck the second, and myself the third. We had an election on the thirteenth, and chose an Alcalde, Second Alcalde and Sheriff. We polled one hundred and forty votes. (Wells 57)

While detailed descriptions of the founding of other California communities – especially San Francisco – exist, Trinidad is helpful because it was built almost entirely by American settlers, whereas Anglo San Francisco grew out of Mexican San Francisco. Trinidad was founded adjacent to a Yurok village, but not out of it. Hence, Trinidad, as well as other settlements outside the area of Spanish mission and Mexican influence, demonstrate American settler priorities away from the city-planning influence of other settler-colonial groups. The priority of tasks described for Trinidad are, first, surveying the land; second, erecting structures; third, holding elections. Yreka had the same activities, although in a different order. A party of snow-bound travelers struck gold in Yreka Creek in March 1851, precipitating an influx of two-thousand men over the course of six weeks (Wells 62). Most were new to mining, but the few experienced miners quickly took charge in an early community meeting in which the prospectors allocated thirty feet for claims (196). They lived in a tent city “about one half mile northwest of the corner of Oregon and Miner streets, on a little knoll near some springs of water” (197). This location is commemorated today by Yreka's Discovery Park. The encampments and buildings gradually moved downhill, closer to the creek. According to Wells, “Samuel Lockhart moved his saloon down to the creek about the first of May, desiring to be near the center of population.” Lockhart and a few other community leaders began pacing off lots to lay out the town in early May. This project proceeded through 1855 (198). In

Yreka, then, the process of establishing a town began with an election, proceeded on to the erection of permanent and semi-permanent structures, and concluded with surveying. Fort Jones grew more slowly than either Trinidad or Yreka. The first White settlement there was a cabin built in late 1851. This structure soon became the sole property of O. C. Wheelock, who developed it into a trading house and theatre. Over the course of the decade settlers erected other buildings, like a hotel. Settlement accelerated as mining became less profitable. The first town meeting that Wells relates was in 1860 to settle on a name – contenders had been Scottsburg, Scottville and Ottiliewa, but the voters went with Fort Jones (212). It was not until 1872 that the California state legislature gave Fort Jones official boundaries (213). In establishing these three American-initiated towns, then, settlers demonstrated three basic priorities: surveying the land, building permanent structures, and holding elections. I will consider each of these priorities as they relate to theatre.

Land surveying appears in much of the booster literature but – interestingly – it is not so prominent in theatre. The first eleven chapters of Cox's *Annals of Trinity County* are structured geographically, tracing the history of mining claims and other settler endeavors on the various tributaries and bars of the Trinity River. Wells devotes a chapter to the topography of Siskiyou County. Soulé et al. (81-82) provide perhaps the best window into the goal of this literary surveying by, first, to naturalizing California's distance from Mexico to prove that it never should have been part of that nation at all. Second, they insist on American superiority as a way to base American claims to California on merit since California was not only set off from Mexico by deserts in the

south and south east, but from the United States as well by the Sierra Nevadas in the east and Siskiyou in the north.

This flag-planting rhetoric, however, was not so prominent in theatrical literature. Few plays of the Gold Rush were set in California. More often, however, plays were nostalgic. Foster writes about a ferry between San Francisco and Sonoma, where a group of soldiers were performing Benjamin Webster's *The Golden Farmer*, in the fall of 1847 "for the purpose of affording the homesick an opportunity to see a real show once more" (39). De Russailh, in his less-than-sentimental tone, indicates something similar with regards to French theatre in the early 1850s: "French plays and light comedies, some of which I saw in Paris, are frequently translated and put on here, for example Don César de Bazan, Le Joueur, and several amusing things from the Théâtre des Variétés: Le Chevalier du Guet, and Bruno le Fileur, among others" (20-21). As shown above, more English-language plays were British imports than not.

Some early theatre architecture was haphazard and thrown together by enterprising troupes. Describing the Eagle in Sacramento, McCabe writes

The roof was of sheet iron and tin, and when the rains set in, the noise was not a very desirable accompaniment. The stage was built of any economical lumber that could be found. Dressing rooms, there were none. The scenery was very sparse, consisting, I think, of three scenes only, and those with a drop curtain, were painted by a Mr. George Wilson, who was paid \$50 per day. The auditorium consisted of a so-called dress circle and parquette. The price of admission was \$3 and \$2. The entrance to the dress circle was up a flight of steps erected outside the theatre--the entrance to the parquette, was through the Round Tent [the adjoining gambling hall]. (cited on Foster 49)

While the Eagle was little more than a hastily constructed annex, the Jenny Lind in San Francisco developed into a civic institution. The first Jenny Lind was outfitted above the Parker House Saloon by impresario Tom Maguire (Foster 68). It opened on 30

October 30 1850 (69). After Jenny Lind I burnt in the fire of May 1851, Maguire built Jenny Lind II that summer on the site of the first (85). It was dedicated on 19 May, and burnt in the next fire on 22 June. On 4 October, Maguire opened Jenny Lind III. This theatre was meant to be more fireproof than the previous two: according to Foster, the “front of the building was constructed of finely dressed yellow-tinted sandstone, brought from Australia”. It seated 2,000 people (89) By 1852, the Jenny Lind was struggling, so Maguire sold it to the city of San Francisco for \$200,000 dollars (113). The space was gutted and refitted to become a municipal building.

The final step in establishing a settler colony like Trinidad was the establishment of a democratically elected government. Theatres could assist in this by serving as civic meeting places. Records describing this use are predominantly from Placerville. In Placerville, the Democratic Party had meetings in the Placerville theatre in May of 1855 (Brumfield & Burwell, Burwell) and June of 1855 (“Democratic Meeting”). The Placerville theatre also hosted booster meetings advocating for routing road to be put through from Carson to San Francisco through Placerville in 1855 and 1856 (Harvey, Harvey & Wadsworth), the formation of a “Pioneer Association” in 1855 (“Pioneer Association”) and an anti-Mormon lecture in 1857 (“Lecture on Mormonism”). In a rural community like Placerville, theatre became a social gathering place associated with democratic assembly, but theatre’s emphasis on social change was not limited to assemblies like those in Placerville. Theatre as a whole was supposed to have a moralizing and civilizing influence, or at least potential, as Soulé et al. describe at some length:

Ever since all Greece gathered to witness the quadrennial contests of the Olympic sports, and the maidens of Rome wafted kisses to victorious

gladiators; or rather, since Thespis, thus made immortal, drove about his cart-load of histrionic pioneers to the delight of gazing Athens, mankind have refused to imitate their primeval ancestors, who, tending their flocks by day, and their families by night, suffered neither from *ennui* nor *atrabilis* - but require what they call amusements, to make life tolerable. The theatre, and its derivatives, the opera, ballet, circus and hippodrome, have been called the great instruments of social progress. Whether they deserve this high claim or not, it is at least certain that their advance has been co-ordinate with that of civilization, and that such exhibitions have become essential in the present day. The mind, like the body, refuses to return to its original nakedness after it has been adorned with the laced trappings of ingenious art. The homespun, the broadcloth, the silk and satin, and the royal purple, have supplanted the fig-leaf and the bear-skin, and their wearers have the same increase of mental foppery. (Soulé et al. 653-654)

Soulé et al. demonstrate that the purpose of their boosterism is to market San Francisco as “a city which is destined, one day, to be, in riches, grandeur and influence, like Tyre or Carthage of the Olden time, or like Liverpool or New York of modern days.”

(22) Their conception of culture echoes that of *King Lear*: “Unaccommodated man is no more but such a poor, bare, forked animal as thou art”, referencing the naked Edgar (3.4.97-98).⁴ This selection from Shakespeare is useful because it posits arts and culture as the dividing line between humans and other animals. Those without recognized culture, as we will see, were viewed as animalistic or savage. This mindset, seen in the theatre and theatre criticism of the Gold Rush both illustrates the continuum between civilization and savagery that structures racial consciousness for the incipient American hegemony in California and southern Oregon during the period, and centers that structure around arts and culture.

Part of this culture, for Soulé et al., is entertainment. Theatre, because of its purported intellectualism and morality, is the most valuable kind of entertainment for

⁴ Based on the accounts of de Russailh (19-20) and Foster (81, 90, 181, 200), *King Lear* was one of the popular Shakespeare plays of this period.

them. However, theatre was not the sole form of entertainment. It competed, sometimes unsuccessfully, with gambling (de Russailh 17). Boosters like Soulé et al., however, associated gambling with prostitution (384), and People of Color. Soulé et al. describe Chinese men as “constantly engaged in gambling” while Chinese women as prostitutes and “the most indecent and shameless part of the population.” De Russailh attributes gambling to Mexicans: “In the daytime, hardly anyone is in the gambling-houses except Mexicans, seated around the monte tables and stirred to high greed by the huge banks” (13). In ways explored more thoroughly below, contemporary theatrical and paratheatrical literature casts both prostitutes and People of Color as essentially vicious. Prostitutes, especially in Soulé et al., are typified by Women of Color (384, 412). Even though the available clientele for both brothels and gambling halls was largely white, and white women did work as prostitutes (de Russailh 27, Soulé et al. 412), associating gambling with prostitution with people of color established all three as vicious. Theatre, on the other hand, was perceived to be virtuous. In the long quote above, part of that virtue comes from its perceived incitement of mental activity. The ethic developed here is that of a Cartesian dualism, where men and Whites were associated with the virtuous mind, while women and People of Color were associated with the body. Isaac Cox, in his *Annals of Trinity County*, establishes that what theatre makes its audience think about is the difference between virtue and vice (129). In a case study of Falstaff that develops this notion, J. G. Kelly claims that “In giving us Falstaff as a type of sensual profligacy, shameless selfishness, good humor, and wit, Shakspeare [sic] has not left us without the cautions properly suggested by the contemplation of such a career. With true poetical justice he is dismissed from the stage with a terrible and crushing rebuke from the

reformed prince..." (356). In Kelly's reading of *Henry IV Part 2*, Falstaff stands for corporeal vice. His primary vices, in Shakespeare's text, are alcoholism and sexual profligacy. As will be shown below, 19th century Americans were constructing both of these as against the norm through the temperance movement and its attendant melodramas and by normalizing chastity through demonization of prostitution and polygamy. Prostitution, further, was associated with Women of Color, sometimes French women, but never with Anglo-Saxon women. Falstaff, therefore, is animalistic and effeminate through a Gold Rush reading. Hal, once crowned King Henry V, stands for intellectual virtue, associated with men, Whiteness, and sobriety. He achieves this association through his public rejection of Falstaff and the gendered and racialized vices for which the latter stands.

This connection to sobriety is of interest because it highlights one application of theatre's virtuous veneer: the moral reform melodrama. These were activist plays that used emotional sensationalism to motivate audience engagement with the playwright's cause. John W. Frick associates the early (1840s) popularity of the moral reform melodrama dealing with temperance with the Washington Temperance Movement (44). The Washingtonians were organized in Baltimore in 1840 by working-class alcoholics as a support group (Martin 138). Unlike our modern Alcoholics Anonymous, however, the Washingtonians relied on public testimonials that relied on "suasion" to advocate for temperance. Suasion, because it sought an emotional reaction, was gendered as feminine against masculine appeals to rationality and prohibitive laws. William Henry Smith's *The Drunkard; or, the Fallen Saved*, "The most famous temperance drama of the decade" (Fisk 44), owed its national popularity very much to its depiction of *delirium tremens*

(Hughes 47). In the fourth act of *The Drunkard*, the protagonist and title character Edward Middleton experiences a fit of madness caused by drunkenness (Smith 289). Demonstrating the debilitating effects of alcohol through a display of grotesquerie is a suasive strategy by which the artists argue for temperance not through punitive action but rather by eliciting an emotional reaction against Middleton's excess. Hughes further argues that by staging the spectacular in moral reform melodramas like *The Drunkard*, theatre artists display the human body as it exists outside of social norms (14). She demonstrates how the word "normal" only took on its current definition as a socially acceptable standard during the nineteenth century (17). The current definition came through the development of controlling institutions like schools, jails, and asylums (4). These institutions sought to eradicate deviance through suppression and hiding, and – based on Martin's analysis – were coded male. Theatre, through moral reform melodrama, sought to squelch deviance by making it visible, and therefore partook of the female-coded suasion. Temperance dramas seem not to have been overwhelmingly popular in California during the 1850s. This is not to say that they were not staged. *The Drunkard* was performed in San Francisco in 1852 ("Theatrical", *Daily Alta California* 5 February 1852), 1855 ("Musical – Theatrical"), 1856 ("Amusements"), and 1860 in San Francisco (Foster 261). The respondent for the *Daily Alta California* in 1855 notes that *The Drunkard* was sparsely attended while a play featuring bigger named stars in a neighboring theatre was packed.

Plays about the plight of the working poor seem to consist of two plays by English playwright Douglas Jerrold: *Black-Eyed Susan* and *Rent-Day*. Both featuring the threatened eviction of an appealing young couple by an avaricious landlord, and an

attempted rape. *Rent-Day* shows some racial consciousness when one character compares the repo-man's profession to the Atlantic slave-trade. Analysis either by playwrights of these plays or the newspaper critics does not go so far as to compare evictions and clearances of white tenants to the actions taken in California against Indians. This indicates that Californian artists and audiences could not make the imaginative leap from an Anglo-Saxon working class to Indians in the same way that they could with Blacks.

Black-Eyed Susan premiered at the Surry Theatre in London in June of 1829 (Jerrold 1969, 151), and played in Placerville in November of 1856 ("Placerville Theatre" 15 November 1856, "Theatricals" 15 November 1856). *Rent-Day* premiered at Drury Lane in London in January of 1832 (Jerrold 1966, 261), and played in California at the Eagle Theatre in San Francisco on 27 February 1850. Frick's third category of moral reform melodrama, abolition plays, seems to have been represented in California by *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and *The Octoroon*. *Uncle Tom's Cabin* played in February and March of 1854 at the Adelphi in San Francisco (Foster 145), in May of that year at the American ("Amusements This Evening"), October of that year in Sacramento ("Amusements", *Sacramento Daily Union*, 25 October 1854), September of 1855 ("Musical Theatrical", *Daily Alta California*, 6 September 1855), October of 1858 at Maguire's in San Francisco (Foster 238), June of 1859 ("Amusements", *Sacramento Daily Union*) and August of 1860 at the American in San Francisco (Foster 268). The 1859 production in San Francisco was billed as a "moral and religious drama" that emphasized minstrelsy and spectacle. Samuel Wells and Frank Hussey's Minstrel Troupe opened that evening, and both Wells and Hussey took parts in *Uncle Tom's Cabin* as Phineas Fletcher and Black Sam respectively. After the brief cast list, two thirds of the play bill are taken up by a list

of eight tableaux and seven “Scenic Effects”. This emphasis on minstrelsy, tableaux and backdrops (which included one “moving panorama”) show that *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* worked through spectacular difference to, following Hughes’ theory, establish a social norm. This social norm was both not Black and anti-slavery. The September 1855 production at the San Francisco Theatre was more star-studded – Caroline Chapman played Topsy and Junius Brutus Booth played Uncle Tom. The reviewer’s highlight in this production was Chapman’s comic minstrelsy. Normalcy and difference, in this production, are established through mocking Black people. Boucicault’s *The Octoroon* was less popular than *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, and only played at Maguire’s during July and September of 1860 (Foster 266, 267).

The Drunkard was played for its moral, but was not very popular. Productions of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* seem to have been played for spectacle with only lip-service given to its moral and religious themes. The only moral reform melodrama that seems to have been done both for its moralizing affect and its popularity was *Madalaine; or, The Foundling of Paris*. *Madalaine*, a play that seems to be lost, played at the Placerville Theatre on 28 July 1855 with the endorsement of 50 citizens. (Anderson, “Placer Theatre” 28 July 1855) The 50 citizens offer the local theatre manager, James Potter, a benefit in exchange for producing this play. According to Foster, “A benefit was a complimentary performance offered to an actor who was destitute, ill, about to leave town, or simply very popular.” (79) Additionally, benefits were given to raise money for causes like “distressed Overland emigrants”, “volunteer firefighters”, or building a church (Cox 129-130). They were given by loose organizations of citizens, like the one that advocated for *Madalaine*, or by defined organizations like E Clampus Vitus

(“Theatrical” 26 January 1856) or, as Foster notes, by fire engines (Foster 79, Jones).

These benefits existed somewhere in between the amateur theatre of Mexican California and the burgeoning capitalist theatre of American California.

Just as California’s overall economy shifted from a sort of pseudo-feudal agrarianism to capitalism with American conquest, theatre changed from a way to entertain the aristocracy to a way to make money. In fact, some of the first people to capitalize on theatre were volunteer American soldiers who had too much time on their hands after the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Capitalist theatre emerged, somewhat organically, from the amateur Mexican theatre (which I will profile below). Company C was holding General Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo under house arrest in Sonoma in 1847, and they were apparently all bored, so Vallejo suggested that the soldiers put on a play for him and the local in an old storehouse. The only script they had on hand was *The Golden Farmer*. Company C fixed up the storehouse, and the all-male company put on the play (Foster 22). Apparently, the Sonoma community flocked to the play (23). That fall, when hotelier William A. Leidesdorff started running a ferry up to Sonoma, Company C apparently began charging admission. That same fall, four soldiers from Company F (Mat Gormly, Bill Tindall, Jack Moran, and Long Lee) came up from Santa Barbara and began putting on minstrel shows in Monterey. They were soon joined by members of the disbanded Company C and local skilled craftsmen. They rented out a storehouse from saloon-keeper Jack Swan for \$70 per month and put on, first, *Putnam; or, the Iron Son of ’76* (23-24). The first Monterey performances were amateur (24), but once they got underway, they began charging \$5 for a seat.

Looking at the relative worth of a ticket price, Foster admission to the circus on Kearny between California and Sacramento streets in San Francisco as \$2 to \$3 (51-52). That same year, Soulé et al. give the price of potatoes and brown sugar at 37 ½ ¢ per pound, and the going rates for unskilled labor as \$1 per hour and for skilled labor as between \$12-20 per day. So, admission to the circus was worth just under six pounds of potatoes or brown sugar, or two or three hours of work for an unskilled laborer, or 1/10 to ¼ of a day's work for a skilled laborer. In Sacramento in 1851, board and bed for a week at the Queen City Hotel cost \$27 ("Hotels"). A ticket to the American Theatre in Sacramento cost between \$1 and \$5 ("Amusements" 30 September 1851). For comparison, California's 2019 minimum wage was \$12 per hour. If this is a reasonable homologue for Soulé et al.'s unskilled labor category, then in today's dollars, the price of a theatre ticket price would be between \$24 and \$36.

I have spent this much space on Anglo-Saxon theatre because, as the ethnicity ascending in dominance in the region, their innovations affected not only the relative social position of other races and ethnicities, but also the theatre attributable to those groups. Some of those groups – namely the German, French, Latinx and Chinese populations – had theatres of their own. Other groups – Blacks, Pacific Islanders, and Indians – did not, but were the focus of specific kinds of Anglo-Saxon theatre dealing with the spectacularization of racialized others as a way to normalize Anglo-Saxon culture and identity. Some of the key innovations made by the Anglo-Saxons were in language, architecture, and economy. Cultural products like theatre helped to rationalize and justify the status that Anglo-Saxons were building for themselves.

Germans

Social position

Soulé et al. estimate the German population of San Francisco as between five and six thousand in 1854 (445-446). According to Wells, Germans made up a sizeable portion of the settler population of Siskiyou County (183). Contemporary writers identified them as easily assimilable. They were supposed to be law-abiding (Soulé et al. 446) and industrious (“The Emigrant Question”, Lloyd 59), and they learned English readily. (Soulé et al. 556, Lloyd 59) One of the more significant German settlers was Johann August Sutter. Sutter was born in 1803 in Baden, Germany and immigrated to New York in 1834. He arrived in California in 1839, where he consolidated a minor empire by patronizing American immigrants. By cultivating the allegiance of Americans and concentrating them in northern California, he was able to maintain effective independence from the Mexican authorities in southern California (Gudde 10-11). Another influential group of Germans formed a viniculture cooperative that established the town of Anaheim on the Santa Ana River. “Anaheim” means “home of Ana” in German, and was selected over “Anagau” (“Ana’s valley”) by a one vote margin. Their group of 50 shareholders was headed by George Hansen (Raup 126). They were principally immigrants from “all parts of Germany except its eastern border” (Raup 131). Raup finds this sufficient for a lack of a “distinctly local” culture, meaning a Hannoverer or Holsteiner culture. However, it seems that they did not even emphasize a German culture. They may have “cherished” the German language, but used English publicly. They used irrigation techniques derived from the local Indians and Mexicans. They built their homes out of adobe (Raup 133).

These are two German settlements. The 1860 census does not distinguish nationality of foreign-born Whites by county, but groups them all together. The mean number of foreign-born Whites per county that year was 3,320. Counties with foreign-born White populations above that mean were Alameda, Amador, Butte, Calaveras, El Dorado, Mariposa, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, Santa Clara, San Francisco, Sierra, Trinity, Tuolumne, and Yuba. Like Whites in general, this represents the Bay Area and the Sierra Nevadas to the east. The major differences are the presence of a northern California county (Trinity) and no counties in southern California. The two principal contributors of foreign-born Whites were Ireland (33,147 immigrants) and Germany (21,646 immigrants). From within Germany, immigrants were primarily from Prussia (4,644 immigrants) followed distantly by Bavaria (1,897) and Baden (1,656).

Religion does not seem to have been a primary element in their assimilability, seeing as Jews were categorized as Germans (Soulé et al. 445, Lloyd 401). Like Irish, Jews faced far less persecution on the West Coast than they did in the east or Europe. In part, this is due to the presence of the Chinese (Rosenbaum 6, Pfaelzer xx). Like Irish, Jews were bifurcated into two principal groups, one of whom achieved greater social assimilability than the other. German or Bavarian Jews tended to be Reformists or nonpracticing, and emigrated as a result of conservative backlash against revolutionary movements in Europe in 1848 (Glanz 117, 138, 141; Levinson 2). They also accounted for a majority of Jews in California (Glanz 8). Polish Jews, on the other hand, tended to be Orthodox (Glanz 138) and animosity existed between them and the German Jews (140), who also had more community clout than their Polish co-religionists (141). Other nationalities of Jews like French, Portuguese, Russian and English as well as Sephardic

Jews never achieved the numbers in California to establish robust communities like the Bavarians and Poles (30-31, 138). Jews in general are noted as having participated in the two San Francisco Vigilance Committees in 1851 and 1856 (41), and in county militias (Levinson 66).

On stage

One of the focal points of German community in both San Francisco and Siskiyou County was the *Turnverein*. *Turnverein* were clubs that sponsored cultural events like *Lieder Tafel*, or glee clubs (Wells 183); concerts (Foster 168); and picnics (Wells 184). German language theatre seems to principally have been burlesques and vaudevilles, and to have been shown as one-off engagements at theatres through San Francisco – like the San Francisco Music Hall (Foster 138), the Union Theatre (156) and the Lyceum (251). In 1860, the German Benevolent Society displayed camels in a Camel Pavilion at the Music Hall (272).

Germans (and German Jews) were, like Anglos, understood as people with a history. While Anglo-Saxon history appears most explicitly in Shakespeare's history plays like *Richard III*, Germanic history appears in plays like *Ingomar*, in which one of the ethnic groups are the Alemanni, and *William Tell*, featuring Swiss with Teutonic names like Tell, Melchtal, and Waldman. Jews on stage, however, are separated out from Germans through ethno-religious coding – traits like beards (Sheridan, "The Rivals" 31) and avarice (Sheridan, "The School for Scandal" and Shakespeare, "The Merchant of Venice"). While Gentiles did not indulge in anti-Semitic rhetoric to nearly the same degree in California as elsewhere, the production of plays like *The Rivals*, *The School for*

Scandal and *The Merchant of Venice* shows that anti-Semitism did exist as a general concept looming over Jewish emigrants' heads.

French

Social position

The French were not perceived as assimilable as the Germans. Both Soulé et al. and de Russailh claim that the primary reason for this is that they did not want to learn English (Soulé et al. 463-464, de Russailh 78). Religion does not seem to be as much of a factor. Burchell spends some time trying to demonstrate anti-Catholicism during the Gold Rush to prove that the Irish were persecuted, but only succeeds in showing that these attempts were at most half-hearted. He also does not account for the likelihood that they were coded attacks against Mexican landholders, as opposed to emigrant Irish (162-178). In place of the lack of evidence that religion was a differencing factor between French and Anglo-Saxons, contemporary accounts attest that the difference was primarily linguistic. De Russailh, a French immigrant, puts the blame for this squarely on the Americans: "Most of the Frenchmen here cannot live on friendly terms with the Americans, whom they consider a savage, ignorant people. Repelled by the difficulty of learning English and unable to communicate with Americans, they live entirely among themselves and only do business with each other." He clarifies what he means by "savage" earlier in his *Last Adventure*: "It is difficult not to conclude that the Americans are a savage and primitive race. They have all the characteristics of savages and think only of death and slaughter. They always carry revolvers, and they draw them at the least provocation, and threaten to blow your head off" (13). Savagery, for him, equaled a nihilistic lust for violence and homicide. This kind of savagery, especially with its

emphasis on firearms, was contagious – de Russailh notes that “After eight o’clock in the evening it is hardly ever safe to walk alone on the wharves, and even if you go with a friend, you must be sure to carry a revolver” (18). De Russailh is constructing an alternate civilized-savage continuum which places himself towards the civilized pole, but not without the threat of sliding towards savagery due to contamination by Americans. From an Anglo-American perspective, Soulé et al. note the perceived urbanity of the French:

The presence of the French has had a marked influence upon society in San Francisco. Skilled workmen of their race have decorated the finer shops and buildings, while their national taste and judicious criticism have virtually directed the more chaste architectural ornaments, both on the exterior and in the interior of our houses. Their polite manners have also given an ease to the ordinary intercourse of society which the unbending American character does not naturally possess. The expensive and fashionable style of dressing among the French ladies has greatly encouraged the splendid character of the shops of jewelers, silk merchants, milliners and others whom women chiefly patronize, while it has perhaps increased the general extravagance among the whole female population of the city. (463)

This “extravagance”, however, was not entirely “chaste”. De Russailh notes that the “ten or twelve French women” in San Francisco upon his arrival in 1851 were all sex workers, and that their “attractive houses with a certain amount of comfort and even luxury” were paid for with the dividends from this work, which could range between \$500 and \$600 a night (27). Soulé et al. likewise note the visibility of French prostitutes (364). While their sexualization may have moved them closer to savages in Anglo-Saxon eyes, they were still essentially civilized in that they, like Anglo-Saxons and Germans, had a history. Bulwer-Lytton’s *Richilieu* focuses on its historical title character, Bellini’s *Norma* romanticizes the Roman conquest of Gaul, and Lovell’s *Ingomar* takes place during the Greek colonization of Marseilles.

On stage

The French community in San Francisco had an active theatre presence. As early as February of 1850, the National Theatre on Washington Street was presenting French vaudeville (Soulé et al. 657). By 1852, French language theatre had become a staple at the Adelphi, where a French troupe performed every Sunday (Foster 111). In October of that year, a space devoted to French theatre was being planned. It opened, as the “Union”, in the spring of 1853 (119). However, the primary vehicle of French theatre was the French Theatre company, which moved from the Adelphi to the Metropolitan by 1856, continuing its tradition of Sunday performances. De Russailh, who worked as a playwright in San Francisco, seems to have been intimately familiar with this troupe. It was headed by “Mesdames Eléonore, Adalbert, and Racine” and included “Mademoiselle Alexina Courtois, Mademoiselle Bréa, Messieurs Richer, Paul Sasportas, Léon Prat, Yomini, Nitzl” (23). As we will see below, it was not uncommon for Gold Rush theatres, at least in San Francisco, to be managed by women. It was uncommon for a theatre to have relatively even gender ratio – 4:5 female in this instance. They made their money from ticket sales, but they also had wealthy patrons. De Russailh implies that Mesdames Eléonore, Adalbert and Racine were trading sexual favors for their patronage. However, de Russailh bases this observation on hearsay, and so this may better reflect his own misogyny rather than the actual income streams of the French theatre. The impact of French theatre on Gold Rush theatre is outsized compared to this one lone – if tenacious – troupe. American troupes performed in a variety of genres with French pedigrees – burlesque and burletta, vaudeville and ballet. Burlesque and burletta were sexually suggestive, which relates to the perceived sexual promiscuity of French women.

However, the French were also coded as classy, which is reflected in the notable female attendance for the French Ballet Troupe in Placerville in both 1855 (“The Chapman Family” 14 April 1855) and in 1857 (“Theatrical” 21 February 1857). The French Ballet Troupe seems to have consisted of a Mademoiselle Therese, a Monsieur Schmidt, and a child performer, or “fairy star”, named “La Petite Louise”.

Latin Americans

Social position

The Spanish-speaking population of California blurred the line between White and non-white. This was due to the Spanish and Mexican colonization of California prior to the American conquest. Spanish conquest was driven by the Catholic missions, a string of 18 churches/fortresses/slave camps built by the Franciscans 1769 and 1776. They stretched from San Diego in the south to Sonoma in the north. They were staffed by Spaniards, and employed Indian slave labor. The mission system was eventually replaced by the rancho system in which the Mexican government granted “large tracts of unoccupied land to individuals and encouraged further territorial settlement through the Colonization Act of 1824” (Almaguer 47). This policy effected a three-class system with the large landholders or *gente de razon* on top; rancheros of smaller tracts, “skilled rancho laborers and foremen, artisans in the Mexican pueblos, and a few territorial and local officials” in the middle; with the lowest or working class made up of “the subjected Indian population and a few mestizos” (48). Because of the clear racing of class, it was easy for 1850s emigrants to racialize them as “Latin-Americans” with Sonorans, Chileans, and Peruvians (de Russailh). Dark-skinned Mexicans, whether Californians or Sonorans, racialized pejoratively as Indian or Black:

The Californian is nearly black; at least, he is so tanned that he looks almost black. His hair is thick and black and nearly as coarse as a horse's mane; there is something savage in his glance; and he has many of the habits of primitive people. As for the Sonoran, he is practically a savage, with a beardless face, big, stupid eyes, a large mouth, and thick, black hair. He goes around half-naked, living on whatever he picks up, and seems to find himself out of place in civilization and to long for his plains and mountains where he ruled undisturbed. He resembles the Indian and undoubtedly has Indian blood. All these people have two dominant vices: gambling and women. (86-87)

Note de Russailh's ultimate sentence, in which he racializes Mexicans as vicious, demonstrating in particular a lack of industry (by gambling) and sexual licentiousness. Upper- and middle-class Californios were also racialized, albeit differently. Since they were somatically White, and had their land rights projected by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (Almaguer 80), more cunning strategies were needed to legitimize their dispossession. One strategy was to romanticize the notion of the chivalrous *hidalgo*:

The barbarous magnificence of an old Californian rider was now seldom seen. The jingling, gaudy trappings of the horse, the clumsy stirrups and leathern aprons, the constant lasso and the reckless rider, had given place to the plain, useful harness of the American and his more moderate, though still dashing riding. (Soulé et al. 362)

This image, which would be developed in the twentieth century as part of the *Zorro* trope (e.g. Mamouljian), served to both historicize Mexican land-tenure and to denigrate it as not as industrious as Anglo land tenure. Another strategy was to cast Mexican women as sexually available. Soulé et al. decries brown-skinned Mexican prostitutes as more depraved than their White colleagues (412). Light-skinned Mexican women shared this characterization, although in a significantly different way. Historians estimate that Anglo-Mexican intermarriages ranged between 8.7 to 12.2% of Mexican in Los Angeles between 1850 and 1880, to 35% of Mexican marriages in Los Angeles between 1860 and 1870 (Almaguer 58). Almaguer characterizes this intermarriage as trafficking of Mexican women to facilitate the social mobility of Mexican and American men during the transfer

of power from the former to the latter (59). Anglo-Saxon sons-in-law were important allies for Mexican patriarchs attempting to protect their landholdings, while marrying into established ranchero families gave Anglo-Saxon men access to extant power structures. The upshot for Mexican women is that “[t]hey often became the exotic prize that many Anglo men arrogantly believed were part of the spoils of conquest” (59).

Violence against California’s Latin American population was not always merely ideological. One of the bloodier moments of the beginning of Anglo San Francisco was the affair of the Hounds. This was a sort of early street gang. It was composed of young American men who paraded around San Francisco during the first half of 1849 in “a kind of military discipline, under the guidance of regular leaders, who wore a uniform, and occasionally, but only on Sundays, paraded the streets with flags displayed and drum and fife playing” (Soulé et al. 227). Their *raison d’être* was pillage – they would burglarize anybody’s establishment during broad daylight, but they focused on the Chilean, Peruvian and Mexican tent encampments in the hills above San Francisco. Their violence escalated when “a young man by the name of Beatty, not properly one of themselves, but who happened to be among or near the band at the time, received a fatal shot from one of the attacked foreigners” (556-557). The Hounds changed their name to the Regulators and began to frame their violence as protecting white San Franciscans from their Latin American neighbors. In other words, they used Beatty’s death as a way to frame the Mexican, Chilean, and Peruvian community as a violent threat to San Francisco’s merchant class. This reflects a broader cultural tendency to criminalize Latin Americans in San Francisco: “they show more criminals in courts of law than any other class”, and Soulé et al. identify the later Latin American enclave at Dupont, Kearny, and Pacific

streets as “the blackguard quarters of the city” (472). As the Regulators’ increased violence in the Latin American tent city threatened to spill over into the merchant quarters, the merchant class organized an ad hoc police force to bring the Hounds to heel. 20 rioters were arrested (558), nine of whom were found guilty (559). The court sentenced them to imprisonment and hard labor, but the state did not enforce these sentences. Still, the Hounds’ organization was disrupted enough that they were not able to continue their depredations (560).

While light-skinned Mexicans are listed as “White” in the census, Mexican Indians are included in “Indians Domesticated” in 1850 and “Indian” in 1860. In 1850, the mean population of “Indians Domesticated” per county was 948. Counties above that mean were Calaveras, Los Angeles, Mariposa, Nevada, San Diego, and Tulare. This shows a population concentrated in the Sierras – probably as cheap or slave labor – and Los Angeles and San Diego. In 1860 the mean population per county of “Indians” was 405 (a more than 50% reduction). Counties above that mean were Fresno, Los Angeles, Mendocino, Monterey, San Bernardino, San Diego, Tehama, and Tulare. This shows movement south from the mining counties, and still only addresses Indians under American governance. For instance, Cook estimates the Hupa population (which was never under Spanish or Mexican control) in 1861 at about 1,000, whereas the 1860 census shows only 100 Indians in Trinity County (Cook 42).

On stage

Spanish-language theatre was robust in both San Francisco and Los Angeles. In Los Angeles, theatre retained its aristocratic structure from the Mexican period – Kanellos notes that Antonio F. Coronel, who would become mayor of Los Angeles, built

a theatre adjacent to his house in 1848 (7). This demonstrates a Mexican practice of theatre as entertainment for the aristocracy. Foster notes that it was customary for leading citizens of Mexican California to host religious dramas, or *pastorelas*, in their homes during the Christmas holidays. Churches also presented this work (9). It is easy to see in this a genealogy from the mission theatre of indoctrination through to the Spanish-language theatres of the Gold Rush (7). The racialization of these plays, though, seems to have shifted. During the mission period, the leading roles were played by *gente de razon*, with Indians filling the surplus secondary roles. Indians, especially neophytes, were the primary audience. Theatre filled a pedagogical role in the process of California missionization (8). During the Mexican period, plays presented in rancheros were principally enacted and observed by *gente de razon*. Reverend Colton observed one such play in Monterey in 1847:

We have had the drama of Adam and Eve as a phase in the amusements, which have been crowded into the last days of the carnival. It was got up by one of our most respectable citizens, who for the purpose converted his ample saloon into a mimic opera-house. The actors were his own children, and those near akin. They sustained their parts well except the one who impersonated Satan; he was of too mild and frank a nature to represent such a daring, subtle character...Tears fell here and there among the spectators, as the exiled pair left forever their own sweet Eden. (cited in Foster 19)

Plays *about* Spanish-speakers, however, were more limited and focused on the Black Legend – a narrative about the Spanish conquest of Latin American that focused on the extreme violence perpetrated by Jesuits as a way to give Anglo-Saxon settlers and conquerors the moral high ground (Rawls 42-43). *Pizarro*, one of the only Gold Rush plays dealing specifically with Spaniards or Indians in lands conquered by the Spanish, portrays the title character not as a Great Man of History, but rather as a disgusting pirate who is less Christian than the heathens with whom he is at war. While the titles depicted

Spaniards were limited, *Pizarro*, at least was somewhat popular: it was one of Junius Brutus Booth, Jr.'s primary vehicles (de Russailh 20-21), and Foster notes that it played at the Metropolitan on 12 February 1856 (185). That November, it also played at the Placerville Theatre ("Theatrical" 8 November 1856, "Theatrical" 15 November 1856).

Chinese

Social position

Some of the first Asian immigrants to California were Chinese participants in the Gold Rush. They mainly came from the agricultural Guangdong province. They left both in hope of striking it rich with gold and/or employment with shipping companies, and out of concern for their life chances in China. Conditions within China, including overpopulation, natural disasters, the Opium Wars, and the Taiping Rebellion also motivated Chinese immigration (Almaguer 154). They often contracted with one of the Chinese Six Companies, "who brokered their passage, found them jobs, provided medicine, organized transportation to the [Sierra Nevada] mountains, adjudicated disputes, and demanded discipline (Pfaelzer 25). Not all of these immigrants fit into the "human capital" model of immigration, where "migrants attempt to increase their future utilities" that are not merely economic (Kim 3). Because this model assumes voluntary immigration, it does not account for the thousands of Chinese women who were sold into sexual slavery during the first two decades of statehood in California (Pfaelzer 96). There were fewer than 1,000 Chinese in California in 1850, but by 1852 there were 9,800. In 1860, there were 35,000 (Heizer & Almquist 154). Asians were not counted in either the 1850 or the 1860 Oregon censuses. In 1860, counties with an above-average population of Asians (mean = 794) Amador, Butte, Calaveras, El Dorado, Mariposa, Nevada, Placer,

Sacramento, San Francisco, Sierra, Trinity, Tuolumne, and Yuba. Their population was therefore focused on San Francisco and Sacramento and the mining counties to the east in the Sierras, as well as Trinity County, which was a mining county just south and east of the Siskiyou.

Perhaps more so than any other group of immigrants, the Chinese were cast as foreign. In the 1870s, when the push for Chinese exclusion was building steam, B. E. Lloyd criticizes the Chinese for their difference from Anglos: "*But Chinese immigration must be stopped*, or they must adopt a style of life that is not offensive to refined American taste" (216). As far back as the 1830s the Chinese were exoticized through derisive humor (Almaguer 158). Soulé et al. observe that in the early 1850s, "The white immigrant, who may never before have met with specimens of the race, involuntarily stops, and gazes curiously upon this peculiar people, whose features are so remarkable, and whose raiment is so strange, yet unpretending, plain and useful" (386). According to Lloyd, staring at the Chinese was a familiar activity even into the 1870s (236). By intensely casting the Chinese as foreign, white Californians were able to isolate them into ethnic enclaves not only in cities like San Francisco, but also in the mining camps. While Soulé et al. claim that "individuals of the race reside and carry on business in every quarter of the city" (381), only 10 to 15% of San Francisco's Chinese population worked outside of Chinatown (Ong 74).

Yreka had a Chinatown located "from Main street to the creek, and from Miner to Center streets" (Wells 204), which is currently between Interstate 5 exit 775 and State Route 3. Like the Latin American tent community outside of San Francisco, which was targeted by the Hounds, Yreka's Chinatown was also a site of racial hate crimes. On

Independence Day of 1856, the “ancient and honorable order of Eclampus Vitus” ran a mob through Yreka’s Chinatown “kicking in the doors of their humble dwellings, as well as otherwise abusing the denizens of that delectable locality” (108). In 1878, the neighborhood caught fire, which was “[b]y great exertion...confined to that locality.” (204) Out of town, Chinese miners established ethnically specific claims at Greenhorn; Long Gulch; Humbug; Cottonwood; Beaver, Hungry and Grouse Creeks; Junction Bar; Sandy Bar; Quartz Valley; Rattlesnake Creek; Indian Creek; McAdams Creek; Salmon River; South Fork of Salmon; Mathews Creek; and Cecilville (194-196). Claims like these put Chinese miners into direct competition with White miners exacerbated the latter’s racial animas, contributing to events like those in Yreka (Almaguer 164). This racism was not only demonstrated by exoticizing Chinese Californians. Chinese women were derided as not only as prostitutes, but as disgusting prostitutes (Soulé et al. 384). White writers ascribe their sexual repulsion to the Chinese to bestial characteristics (Almaguer 158, Lloyd 237).

Events like the Weaverville War of 1854 caught the White public’s imagination and showed the Chinese community as a violent threat. As far away as Placerville, the *Democrat* reported that

We are indebted to Mr. E. A. Rowe, agent of Cram, Rogers & Co.’s Express at Weaverville, Trinity county, for the following highly interesting intelligence:

On the 15th inst., the Chinamen, who have been so long preparing for battle, met and had an engagement one half mile east of Weaverville, but within full view of the town. Some six or eight were killed, also one white man. A large number were wounded. They are still fighting. Pistols, pikes and spears are freely used. One party is about 150 strong, the other three times as numerous. The Sheriff has failed, after using every endeavor, to quell the difficulty.

Four o’clock. They have ceased for a while in order to bury their dead. The number killed is ten. *Sacramento Union* (Rowe)

In the Placerville *Democrat*, this article ends a column that includes information on the revolution in Peking, shipping between China and San Francisco, and Chinese immigration. The overarching narrative of the column seems to be that the Chinese were importing their civil strife to California where American police were unable to quell their violence. The mention of the Trinity sheriff's ineffectiveness is telling in light of E Clampus Vitus's⁵ pogrom in Yreka. If civil authorities could not deal with perceived threats, then vigilante mobs certainly could and would. The irony is that the China War was choreographed by local Whites. Based on eye-witness accounts, Cox describes that once the battle lines had been drawn, the crowd of a thousand or so spectators pushed the larger party – the Ah Yous, who had been slandering the smaller party, the Young Wos, with the Whites – into battle. A troupe of 20 or 25 Whites armed with rifles led the Ah Yous into battle. None of the Chinese were armed with firearms. The White man who died, a Swede named John Malmberg, died of a bullet wound to the head. On the basis that none of the Chinese were armed with guns, Cox surmises that Malmberg was assassinated by another White (144-145).

On stage

The Chinese theatre in San Francisco was both a site of Chinese community, and White voyeurism. One of the first performances of the Chinese community in San Francisco was a seven-member orchestra that played on 21 July 1851 (Foster 87). A proper Chinese theatre arrived in October of 1852. The Hong Took Tong Dramatic Company presented a series of Chinese plays at the American Theatre. It was “liberally

⁵ E Clampus Vitus was a fraternal organization that still maintains chapters today. In addition to this pogrom in Yreka, they sponsored a theatre benefit in Placerville in 1856 (“Theatrical”, *Democrat*, 19 April 1856).

patronized by local Cantonese” and financed by the Chinese merchant class in San Francisco. The troupe, consisting of 123 performers, was brought over with “the framework of a large theatre” which they constructed and opened on 23 December. Foster, writing in 1936, says that “[s]ince that time there has been at least one Chinese theatre in San Francisco at all periods almost without exception – at the peak, six operating at one time” (118). Chinese were not the only ones who attended the Chinese theatre – Foster continues that “[t]he Chinese players and their music have always been cause for wonder and some ridicule by resident San Franciscans...” In 1860, “a troupe of Chinese actors in route to Paris” played in San Francisco and “[t]he ‘Gorgeous Mongolian Spectacle’ aroused much laughter from an unappreciative and profane audience” (264). Lloyd, writing in the 1870s, gives some detail about the performance structure:

A single play continues nightly, from one to three months, before the final act is reached. Their dramas are simply the reproduction of very ancient historical events, the minutest details being faithfully represented. Apparently they do not relish plays based upon modern occurrences, and hence there are few of such enacted. Viewing it from an American standpoint, the Chinese drama is in a very crude state, but perhaps an intelligent Chinaman would pronounce the same criticism on the art as presented on our own stages... (264-265)

Besides his commendable recognition that he does not appreciate Chinese drama because he never acquired the taste for it, rather than describing Chinese drama as inherently stupid and bad, Lloyd also notes the historical emphasis of Chinese theatre. Just as English, German, French and Spanish language drama described Europeans and Euro-Americans as people with a history, Chinese drama described the Chinese as people with a history.

Blacks

Social position

The first Blacks in California came to dig gold; some as entrepreneurs like their White contemporaries (Wells 216), and others as the enslaved labor of those White contemporaries (Lapp 4). White prospectors, at least those who could not afford to enslave people, immediately objected to Black presence in California. Their stated fear was that these miners would degrade the value of White labor (Heizer & Almquist 105).

California convention delegate Oliver M. Wozencraft argued that he desired

To protect the people of California against all monopolies – to encourage labor and protect the laboring class. Can this be done by admitting the negro race? Surely not; for if they are permitted to come, they will do so – nay they will be brought here. Yes, Mr. President, the capitalists will fill the land with these living laboring machines, with all their attendant evils. Their labor will go to enrich the few, and impoverish the many; it will drive the poor and honest laborer from the field, by degrading him to the level of the negro. (Heizer & Almquist 107)

Wozencraft further objected to Black emigration by evoking the bogeyman of civil strife between Whites. Without Blacks, California could be a place where “civilization may attain its highest altitude; Art, Science, Literature will here find a fostering parent, and the Caucasian may attain his highest state of perfectibility.” However, Black neighbors would become “a discordant element” that would inhibit his golden dreams of a democratic utopia where all citizens worked together as equals (108).

He contended that left to their own devices, White people could form a cohesive society whose crowning achievement would be the development of intellectual pursuits in the arts and sciences. However, they were held back by the civil strife between the Slave Power in the South and the free states in the North over the possibility of admitting territories acquired in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (like California) as slave states

(Landis 10). According to Wozencraft, this dissention was not the fault of the White people, but rather the toxic influence of the Blacks in their midst. The upshot of this discussion, of which Wozencraft was a part, was anti-Black legislation ranging from a bar on admittance in the California Constitution in 1849 (Heizer & Almquist) to a state Fugitive Slave Law in 1852 (Lapp 9).

One of the ways in which Blacks were perceived as antithetical to civilization was in their use of language. Wells narrates an episode in Siskiyou County history in which

a negro preacher came to Johnson's Bar, and discoursed one Sunday night to a small audience. The sporting men thought there was a chance for fun, and during the week notified the exhorter that he must prepare a good sermon for the next Sunday, as he would have a large and intelligent audience. A large crowd went to see the fun, for the gamblers intended to throw potatoes and other vegetables at the head of the minister, whenever he lapsed into any of the peculiarities of the plantation orator. The man, however, was a good talker, and instead of throwing potatoes they took up a good collection for him. This continued several weeks, the hat receiving twenty-five or thirty dollars every time it went round, and all seemed serene and fair. The exhorter began to suspect that he was playing with fire, and one morning inquiry was made for 'the preacher' and no one could tell where he was, nor has any one been able to tell since. (109)

As the final sentence indicates, disdain for “plantation speech” was a merely an indicator of an undercurrent of racial threat against Blacks in California. The Placerville *Mountain Democrat* does away with Wells’ verbose subtlety – in writing about Black Republicans, the anonymous author says that “We not only offended them, but what mortifies us more, some of our respectable 'cullud pussons' are down on us for intimating that they know and associate with the getters up of the new party" (“Hard to Please”). This characterization of Blacks as inarticulate was used as an indicator of subpar intelligence. That same issue of the *Mountain Democrat* approvingly cites the New York *Tribune* as characterizing Blacks and Irish together as “both depressed below the average standard

and intelligence of the community in which they are placed” (“Making Up to the Know-Nothings”).

The result of this racial animas, especially as enshrined in state law, meant that 962, or 1.04% of the 92,597 California residents counted in the 1850 Census were “Free Colored.” In 1860, this number had risen to a mere 4,086, or 1.08%, of 379,994 counted residents. Of that, 2,557 or 0.7% were Black and another 1,529 or 0.4% were “Mulatto.” Counties with above-average Black populations in 1850 (mean = 36) were Calaveras, El Dorado, Mariposa, Sacramento, Solano, Tuolomne, and Yuba. That means that they were concentrated in Sacramento and the mining counties in the Sierras to the east. In 1860, counties with above-average Black populations (mean = 93) were Calaveras, El Dorado, Nevada, Sacramento, San Francisco, Tuolomne, and Yuba. The addition of San Francisco is perhaps due to the absence of data from that county in the 1850 census. This low density of Black population is the primary reason why they were not subjected to the same intense violence as Chinese and Indian communities (Pulido xxxviii). There were enough Black residents to organize two “Colored Conventions” that agitated for equal testimony rights (Lapp 7-8) – People of Color were barred from giving testimony in court against a White defendant – but not enough to support community focused theatres like those of the Germans, French, Latin Americans, and Chinese. And yet Black imagery was popular on the California stage.

On stage

Some of the first Anglo theatre in California was done in blackface. During American conquest, four volunteers gave “two burnt cork entertainments” in Santa Barbara before moving up to Monterey (Foster 23-24). This was the beginning of the

Monterey theatre, which – like its Mexican predecessors – was initially part of a landowner's house. This theatre, acted in by volunteer soldiers, did "one heavy performance...each week, with interludes of minstrelsy and light comedy..." (24). Minstrelsy remained popular through the 1850s, even while other styles of theatre followed more faddish cycles. In August of 1855, there were five different minstrel troupes playing in San Francisco (171). They relied on impressions of Blackness, including malapropisms (44). At times, these troupes would perform as headliners. At others, they would be incorporated into a vaudeville evening, a typical example of which Clay Greene describes in his memoir:

...managers were given free rein, with the result that downright indecency was the crux and purpose of nearly all of them. The form of program was nearly identical in each, generally beginning with a minstrel first part, followed by an olio and concluding with an afterpiece, which all too often was based on an immoral story and its lines bristled with poorly concealed smut.

The first part was composed principally of women in garishly undress attire, with the two end men in black faces and generally the interlocutor and male quartet in white. The quality of the performances was always excellent, for many of the country's best stars have graduated from the old San Francisco melodeons and variety halls. But the jokes, and gags, and stories never aspired to any sort of moral complexion, and on the conclusion of the first part it was customary for the ladies of the circle to visit the occupants of the boxes on the second tier and act as boosters for the bar. (Foster 256)

As Greene indicates, these performances were targeted towards a male audience. Foster notes that the Bella Union, a saloon and music hall in San Francisco, usually billed its entertainment as "for men only" (233). The *Mountain Democrat's* 3 May 1856 advertisement for the California Minstrels is also specific in the gender of its audience ("California Minstrels"). This gendering had to do with a perceived lack of morality, which Greene is not alone in noting. The San Francisco *Golden Era* of 29 October 1854 bemoans that "During the week, large audiences attended the disgustingly vulgar and

demoralizing performances of a troupe of gentlemen (!) styling themselves 'Christy's Minstrels.' No truly moral community should patronize such people. Vulgarly is their forte" (Foster 152, emphases in original). As seen above, White women were associated with a moralizing influence necessary for civilization. At least so far as minstrelsy went, Blackness and respectable White femininity were perceived incompatible. This hints at the sexual threat dramatized in *Othello*. By Foster's count, *Othello* played frequently in San Francisco as a favorite role of stars like Junius Brutus Booth, Sr. (115) and James Stark (120-121). Plays like *Othello*, *Uncle Tom's Cabin* or *The Octoroon*, which feature Black characters excluded Black actors in favor of white actors in blackface. The avenue for Black performers on the California stage was in minstrelsy. This does not seem to have gained traction, however, until the middle of the decade at the Metropolitan, in April 1855: "For three nights a troupe of colored magicians and minstrels called the 'Ethiopian Fakir Troupe' played at the Hall; then the San Francisco Minstrels returned" (165). That said, Blacks were not necessarily excluded from the theatre – in 1851, the Jenny Lind "fitted up [the gallery] in elegant style expressly for the respectable colored people" (102). They had to sit out of sight of the White people, and assimilate to white theatrical norms, but – within those limits – Black Californians were allowed in the theatre. When this early audience engagement strategy is looked at with Black minstrels, it becomes clear that – not having any theatres of their own – Black Californians could only be in the theatre if they behaved themselves within parameters that white Californians laid out for them. And, as the legislative discussion sketched above shows, those parameters were tight.

Pacific Islanders

Social position

Natives of Oceania constituted a distinct yet under-reported-on group during the California Gold Rush. During the 19th century, Hawaiian men would leave the Islands to work primarily as guano harvesters in the south Pacific, or whalers in the North Pacific. To a lesser extent, they took jobs as laborers in the Pacific Northwest fur trade and on California ranches. John Sutter, for instance, had eight “Kanakas” (a now-derogatory word for Pacific Islander laborers) in his employ. During the Gold Rush, “[s]everal hundred” more Hawaiians immigrated to California (Barman and Watson 152). While many came as laborers for White prospectors (Wells 193), but others struck out on their own (139). These immigrants assisted Whites in their campaign of violence against Indians – Wells tells a story about a Hawaiian climbing on the shoulders of a Cayuse or Chinook prisoner at Scott Bar to get a noose around his neck (104). While they were generally allied with Whites, Whites relegated them to a low rung on the racial ladder. De Russailh claims that “Kanakas are savages who have been a trifle civilized” (89). His assessment matches that of White Oregon pioneers who considered Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders “barbarians” (Barman and Watson 161), but found their acceptance of Christianity preferable to the Indigenous religions of local tribes (112).

On stage

Their labor was principally in mining, but some were performers: Foster mentions a situation from 1851 in San Francisco in which “there was offered an 'exhibition of natives of New Zealand, Toomboo & New Caledonia,'--admission \$1, ladies free,-- which remained for a week” (100). Since Toomboo (now Toowoomba City) is in what is

presently Queensland, this category includes the Indigenous people not only of Oceania, but also of Australia. A similar performance, purportedly by a Bornean, highlighted the perceived subhumanity of Pacific Islanders. The Placerville *Democrat* advertised

This wonderful living nondescript, discovered on the Island of Borneo, in a savage state, is without any doubt the most astonishing curiosity in the world. Its mode of traveling is upon all-fours; it speaks the English language well. This wonder of the world has been examined by the principal medical men in the United States, and pronounced by them a combination of man and beast.

P.S. This curiosity has just arrived in California, through Mexico, and has never been exhibited in San Francisco or Sacramento.

Will be exhibited in Placerville, at the Empire Saloon. Monday, August 27th.

Admittance, 50 cents; children, 25 cts. ("Ninth Wonder of the World")

This advertisement demonstrates how the continuum between "civilization" and "savagery" did not stop at "savagery" but continued on to nonhuman animals. If, for instance, Latin Americans were about midway between "civilization" and "savagery", Indigenous people and other People of Color were seen as midway between human and animal.

"The Ninth Wonder of the World" was subsequently staged at Sutter Hall in Marysville in November of 1855. The Marysville *Daily Herald* clarifies that the performer was not actually a native of Borneo, but rather "a miserable cripple, who makes his deformity hideous by exhibiting himself to the public for a consideration. At San Francisco he was arrested and put in the station house, where he deserves at this time to be..." (Hauser). He performed again in Sacramento "above the City Market" on 3 and 4 January 1856 ("The Wonderful Living Nondescript"). Citing Robert Bogdan, Amy Hughes describes the process by which "freaks" were constructed: "nineteenth-century entrepreneurs fashioned freaks using two modes of representation: the exotic, which

emphasized ‘the culturally strange, the primitive, the bestial, the exotic’ (African Bushmen, Circassian Beauties, Aztec Children, tattooed men and women, and ‘missing link’ exhibits); and the aggrandized, which ‘emphasized how, with the exception of the particular physical, mental, or behavioral condition, the freak was an upstanding high-status person with talents of a conventional and socially prestigious nature’ (well-dressed giants, dwarves, bearded women, conjoined twins, living skeletons, and fat ladies)” (20-21). The performer in “The Ninth Wonder” seems to have been a disabled person with limited work options and trouble with the law who needed to get out of San Francisco and found a way to turn his disability into money by performing as a “missing link”. In doing so, he mobilized popular understandings of Bornean natives as “Wild Men” who engaged in behavior similar to those ascribed to California Indians (see below) such as casual sex, sleeping rough and not in houses, and who are hunted by members of the Dayak ethnic group of Borneo “the same as monkeys, from which they are not easily distinguished” and subsequently mutilated and enslaved (“Wild Men of Borneo”). The performer was able to utilize recognizable tropes while simultaneously disguising himself as a racial type that – through lack of exposure – White audiences would not immediately recognize.

Indians

Social position

The prevailing ideology around California and southern Oregon Indians was a teleology of disappearance. Soulé et al., as seen above, attribute this to a teleology of Anglo-Saxon ascendancy (53-54). Wells likewise describes genocide using the placid imagery of flowing water: "Suffering less by hostilities with the whites than the Modocs,

the Shastas have melted away before the advance of the Caucasian race like snow before the warm rays of the sun" (121). This disappearance was not fated, however – it was planned and enacted by settler violence, introduction of diseases and depletion of indigenous food supplies. Cox reports that "The Indians on Hay Fork, all counted, would not amount to fifty, are in a destitute, miserably squalid condition, and a census of them would exhibit a sad disproportion of the sexes, there being perhaps five bucks to one squaw" (109). He confirms himself as a teleologist, however, when he opines that "[w]hether the dividing-all-Fourierite-system of national economy prevailed here previous to 1492, is now too late in the season of human progress to decide for to the benefit of the red man." A writer for the *Sacramento Union* on 3 February 1855 likewise splits the difference between white violence and progressive teleology:

The fate of the Indian is fixed. He must be annihilated by the advance of the white man; by the diseases, and, to them, the evils of civilization. But the work should not have been commenced at so early a day by the deadly rifle. (Heizer 36)

The writer's point is clear – Indians were too savage to brook the advent of the White man and will die whether or not White men commit genocide. It would be better to just let it happen rather than to be inhumane and aggressive about it. California Governor Peter H. Burnett was not so complacent – he advocated for a violent solution: "That a war of extermination will continue to be waged between the two races until the Indian race becomes extinct, must be expected; while we cannot anticipate this result with but painful regret, the inevitable destiny of the race is beyond the power and wisdom of man to avert" (Heizer & Almquist 26). At least one White writer put the blame for Indian population collapse on Indians. This anonymous writer for the *San Joaquin Republican* describes Indian-on-Indian violence when he reports that "on the night of December 12th,

an Indian, at least one hundred years old, had his throat deliberately cut, on the Tuolumne river, near Dickinson's, by a party of Indians from La Grange" ("An Old Indian Murdered"). Other observers, like Stephen Powers, seem to get the point that population collapse is due to white will, as opposed to fate. Part of the reason he gives for his series on "The California Indians" in *Overland Monthly* is that

Fatal for him [the Indian] was the unconscious guardianship of these apples of Hesperides; and in what proportion the gold of his placers was beautiful in the eyes of the White Man, in that proportion was he the dragon, odious to look upon, and worthy of death. It is small concern of pioneer miners to know aught of the life-story, customs, and ideas of a poor beggar, who is so fatuously unwise as to complain that they darken the water so he can no longer see to pierce the red-fleshed salmon, and his women and papposes are crying for meat; and when he lies stiff and stark in the arid gully, where the white, pitiless sun of California shakes above him the only winding-sheet that covers his swart body, he is not prolific in narration of his people's legends and traditions. Dead men tell no tales. (April 1872, 325)

Powers is blunt that, had the "White Man" not wanted gold, he would not have wantonly killed Indians with the same moral certainty as an old Teutonic hero slaying a dragon. Kenderdine is likewise upfront that "the Indian was considered as a nuisance to be abated by bullet and starvation" (262). Other writers were not so sure that complete extermination needed to happen. Whipple, Ewbank and Turner, in their reports for the Pacific Railroad, write that

The aborigines are, upon every side, hemmed in by descendants of a foreign race. Year by year their fertile valleys are appropriated by others; their hunting-grounds invaded, and they themselves driven to narrower and more barren districts. The time is now arrived when we must decide whether they are to be exterminated; if not, the powerful arm of the law must be extended over them, to secure their right to the soil they occupy; to protect them from aggression; to afford facilities and aid in acquiring the arts of civilization, and the knowledge and humanizing influences of Christianity. (Heizer & Almquist 36)

Whipple, Ewbank and Turner's recommendation echoes the mission system and anticipates Indian boarding school founder Richard Henry Pratt's "Kill the Indian

to save the man.” In other words, savagery was entirely cultural and not a product of blood at all. Education could speed the progression from savagery to civilization. Savagery was fated to melt before civilization, but Indians need not themselves disappear.

However, California, Nevada, and southern Oregon Indians, pejoratively called “Digger Indians”, were not necessarily worth saving. “Digger” was in reference to Indian women digging roots for food, and was used to differentiate California, Nevada, and southern Oregon Indians from “noble savages” who engaged in hunts and wars (Rawls 49). Contemporary White writers make an effort to express their disgust at the supposedly bestial attributes of the local Indians. Kenderdine describes the population change at a ruined Spanish outpost in the Great Basin: “Prowling coyotes, venomous reptiles, and those wretched imitations of humanity, the Diggers, now claim to those walls which once formed an abiding place for civilized people” (163). Towards the end of his book, Kenderdine emphasizes that “Diggers” were the most repulsive group of people he encountered on his journeys (295). De Russailh concurs with Kenderdine, pointing out how he was reminded of beasts crawling in out of their dens when he saw California Indians making entrance or egress from their homes (92-93). Animalizing Indians was part of the settler mindset of murder. Several observers comment on how Indian killing was done with the same casualness as one would kill “a wild beast” (Heizer & Almquist 31), “a dog” (34), “a *cayota*, or a wolf” (28).

Indian women were particular targets of this derision. Kenderdine is exceptional only in the graphicness of his descriptions. He illustrates Cheyenne women in the Plains as “old squaws, squatted around their domiciles, gaz[ing] quietly at us through their black, snaky eyes, looking quite as attractive as the fabled dames who guard the portals of the infernal regions” (60). In his depiction of Ute women, he wishes that “the squaws attained a less altitude, though goodness knows they were squatty enough, rarely attaining a height of over four feet. Their faces were hideous, their hair thick and matted, their breasts long and hanging to the waist – altogether they were horrid objects” (134). This denigration included digs at Indian women’s sexual propriety. Powers is fairly clear in his treatment of indigenous sexuality that he is comparing it negatively to settler sexual norms: “Before marriage, virtue is an attribute which can hardly be said to exist in either sex, all the young women being a common possession; but after marriage, when the dishonor of the woman would involve also that of the husband, they live with tolerable chastity, for savages” (April 1872, 330). One of the unacknowledged assumptions he makes here is that women are the sexual property of men. He is perhaps plainer in the December 1872 issue of the *Overland Monthly* when he states that Pomo men have to guard their wives “with a Turkish jealousy - for even the married women are not such conjugal models as Mrs. Ford” (505), referring to the character in Shakespeare’s *Merry Wives of Windsor* who humiliates Falstaff when he solicits her for an out-of-wedlock romance. This notion of owning women through sex helps explain, in part, the high rate of sexual assault against Indian women and girls. The importance of the

local Indian slave trade also makes clear that denigrating Indian women sexually was about owning them: Cox reports a prospector nicknamed “Kentuck” buying an eight or nine-year-old girl for his “seraglio”. When she escaped, Kentuck and his “fellow-citizens” took the opportunity to make a punitive raid on her village leaving four Indians dead and one wounded (114). Reservations were apparently centers of human trafficking: the San Francisco *Bulletin* reports on 13 September 1856 that “Some of the agents, and nearly all of the employees, we are informed, of one of these reservations at least, are daily and nightly engaged in kidnapping the younger portion of the females, for the vilest of purposes” (Heizer 278). However, rape was not always commercial – Lieutenant J. C. Bonnycastle mentions that “squaws are constantly run down, sometimes by men on horses, and raped.” (56) Rape was a tool of war meant to denigrate and take possession of Indian women.

If ideological reasons ran out, White settlers could always scrape for the practical excuse that Indians posed a violent threat. Northern California newspapers were active in stoking fear of Indian raids, and their articles would be picked up by papers further away from sites of violent Indian resistance. The Placerville *Mountain Democrat* cites the Yreka *Union*’s report “that the Indians on the Pitt River have destroyed a large amount of property and murdered five Americans. They have burnt the ferry houses, destroyed the boats, and stolen the cattle from the settlers” (“Another Indian Tragedy”). Even rumors were deemed newsworthy:

A rumor reached Sonoma on Tuesday evening says the *Journal* of that place, to the effect that the Indians living in the upper portion of Ukiah

Valley, Mendocino county, had risen and murdered Col B H Veeder and his family, formerly residents of Sonoma. The family consisted of Mr Pettus, wife and two children, and a brother of Mrs Pettus. We give the report merely as a rumor. ("Rumored Indian Murders")

So, this report was a rumor by the time it reached Sonoma from the upper Ukiah, but was still deemed important to report up in Placerville. This goes to show the hyperbole that White writers would go to in order to drum up fear of Indian violence, but Cox takes it a step further in his *Annals of Trinity County*. Describing an "Indian Massacre", he writes that in "Anno Domini, 1852, one Col. Anderson, a butcher by trade, was camping on Ruch Creek with a lot of cattle he had purchased on Steward's Fork; he was attacked by a band of Indians, and though the subsequent examination of the situation showed every mark that the encounter was accompanied by a brave defense on his part, and on the part of two noble dogs, his companions in arms, he and his dogs were overwhelmed by the enemy and cut off from life" (100). In other words, the killing of one White man and his two dogs constituted a "massacre."

On stage

These boundaries are obscured in Gold Rush theatre. The only Indians on California stages were noble savages played by White actors until, it appears, 1862, when "Indian Warriors of the Tatagua Tribe" performed "at Platt's Hall in May on their way to the World's Fair in London" (Foster 308-309). Noble savages in plays like *Putnam* and *Pizarro* separated local Indians from theatre-goers' conceptions of Indianness. All of the plays representing Indians that I have found present individuals from tribes on the east coast or Peru. While some of these, like the allies of the Tories in *Putnam*, could be treacherous, most were good guys who match the nobility of spirit of white protagonists like George Washington (in *Putnam*) and cast White villains like Pizarro in a negative

light. Villainous Indians were tied not only to tyrannical Tories, but also to Turks – anticipating Powers’ own analogies, cited above. Mrs. Cabbageall, a Patriot housewife, curses the invading English and Indians as “the villains! the rascals! the Turks!” (8). Playwright N. H. Bannister (through Mrs. Cabbageall) and Powers invoke Orientalism in describing the savagery of American Indians and their white allies. In writing about Ottoman governance being used as a foil to define Anglo-Saxon liberty, especially as expressed through private property ownership, English scholar and classic Orientalist McVickar opines that

It is the want of security – the want of any lively and well-founded expectation of being permitted freely to dispose of the fruits of their industry, that is the principal cause of the wretched state of the Ottoman dominions at the present day, as it was of the decline of industry and arts in Europe during the middle ages. When the Turkish conquerors overran those fertile and beautiful countries in which they are still permitted to encamp, they parceled them among their followers...But these possessions are not hereditary. They do not descend to the children or legatees of the present possessor, but, on his death, revert to the Sultan. Among the occupiers of land in Turkey there is, therefore, no thought of futurity. (60-61)

The point here is that futurity of private landownership by American homesteaders is central to the progress of American civilization. Threats to that futurity, whether by foreign powers or by indigenous rivals, constitute ontological threats to America and civilization themselves.

Most stage Indians of the Gold Rush, however, were meant to be role models of nobility or virtue. They are homologous with the “good Indians” described in secondary literature by Audra Simpson and Jeffrey Monaghan. Monaghan, studying Canadian surveillance of Plains Indians, writes that

The term ‘fort Indian’ refers to bands or groups of indigenous peoples that are forced to camp near European forts or outposts. The reference to a ‘fort Indian’ underlines the notion that, from the perspective of

government, traits of docility and subservience are considered ‘good,’ while individuals who refuse to portray an outward display of docility are considered ‘bad.’ (499)

Simpson, writing about current Mohawk sovereignty, defines a “good Indian” as “an Indian that does not threaten white people, is knowledgeable about his/her culture and history, and is forthcoming about that knowledge with white people” (81). The closest thing California got to a “good Indian” during the Gold Rush were stage Indians. These existed solely for White viewing – they had no purpose besides being seen by a white audience. To boot, they were White people dressed as Indians. As such, they were in a better position than real live Indians to argue for the humanity of Indians. Oneactah, in *Putnam*, decries violence like that being committed in California: “The savage is a man; he sees the storm cloud gather over the roof of his wigwam; he sees the war club and the scalping knife raised high in the air; he hears the shriek of his murdered wife, and feels her hot blood upon his cheek; he sees his children dragged from him by a ruthless foe; he sees desolation and woe scattered wide over his hunting ground” (12).

Putnam was one of the first English plays produced in California by the American soldiers in Monterey, mentioned above, in 1847. (Foster 24) It was revived in January of 1853 at the American Theatre in San Francisco, after the genocide against Indians in northern and eastern California and southern Oregon was well underway. *Pizarro* takes it one step further: first, it is set in gold country (Peru), which is not the case for plays set on the Atlantic coast. Las-Casas, the Spanish priest, questions Pizarro’s moral authority by casting the Peruvians as the wronged party:

Is then the dreadful measure of your cruelty not yet complete?---Battle!---gracious Heaven! Against whom?---Against a King, in whose mild bosom your atrocious injuries even yet have not excited hate! But who, insulted or victorious, still sues for peace. Against a People who never wronged the living Being their Creator formed: a People, who, children of innocence!

Received you as cherish'd guests with eager hospitality and confiding kindness. Generously and freely did they share with you their comforts, their treasures, and their homes: you repaid them by fraud, oppression, and dishonor. These eyes have witnessed all I speak---as Gods you were received; as Fiends have you acted. (8)

Not only that, but the Peruvians are also better at democratic governance than the Spanish. Rolla, the Inca prince, announces that “The throne WE honour is the PEOPLE’S CHOICE – the laws we reverence are our brave Fathers’ legacy- the faith we follow teaches us to live in bonds of charity with all mankind, and die with hope of bliss beyond the grave” (23, emphases in original). *Pizarro* was a popular play – it was one of Booth, Jr.’s primary vehicles – and so it was often on stage in San Francisco (de Russailh 20-21, Foster 185), and it played in Placerville during November of 1856 (“Theatrical” 8 November 1856, “Theatrical” 15 November 1856). On first blush, one might say that this is subversive. And yet contemporary writers seem to have made no connection between the play and local Indians or Peruvians, whose conditions stayed more or less the same even with the play. The function of plays like *Pizarro* seems to have been to separate the image of Indians or Peruvians from actual Indian or Peruvian communities. In the case of Indians, it set a high standard. If savages had to be noble and to approximate white values in order to evoke pity, then how could abject “Diggers” compete. The theatre created a focal point for settlers to feel bad about anti-Indian violence away from Indians who might actually get in the way of the land-claims they were in the process of appropriating. This was accomplished through a distinction between the Noble Savage on stage (who was invariably a white actor in a costume) with so-called “Diggers”. The Indian who deserved to be pitied was the one who approached White norms through both cultural choices like democracy over tyranny, and somatic realities like actually having a white not a brown body. Because the standard for pity was so White, no Indian in what is

currently California, southern Oregon or Nevada could hope to achieve it. As such, theatre constructed a situation in which White audience members could decry genocide with their left hand while committing it with their right.

Conclusion

This chapter describes the one-dimensional racial hierarchy that Anglo-American settlers sought to establish in California during the period between 1848 and 1860, and how those attempts were reflected in and bolstered by contemporary theatre. This system was polar with Anglo-Saxons standing at the desirable terminus and local Indians at the undesirable terminus. Between these two poles, groups who were neither Anglo-Saxon nor Indian were arranged based on their proximity to a collection of civilized markers attributed to Anglo-Saxons or savage markers attributed to local Indians. A primary dividing line was skin tone. Light-skinned men like Anglo-Saxons, Irish, Germans, French and White Latin Americans were both allowed to vote and exempt from campaigns of terror. Light-skinned women, however, were both excluded from suffrage and targets of sexual violence, which indicates a gendered component of this reign of violence not fully entered into in this chapter. What I have described is the ways in which people closer to savagery on this unilinear model were feminized, but I have not explored how non-Indian or non-Latin American women were targeted. This is primarily due to space, and also because Indian and Latin American communities were the only ones where the female population more or less equaled the racially corresponding male population.

Both skin tone and biological sex were important because they physically indicated in difficult-to-hide ways presumed distancers from civilization. Civilization was

understood to emanate from the mind, which was seen as existing in conflict with and opposition to physical or animal impulses. Animality and impulsiveness were associated with dark skin and uteri, meaning that their antagonistic opposites – humanity and rationality – were associated with fair skin and phalluses. This racially and sexually coded Cartesian dualism was the basis for a system of morality which required a strict regimen of physical control. This involved restrictions alcohol, sex, and violence. Since White men were presumed on account of their rationality to be more moral, it was up to them to control the bodies of women and People of Color. Male strategies of control, however, involved punitive measures like jails, police and – in the absence of a sufficiently rigorous legal apparatus, vigilance committees. White women, therefore, were included in the civilizing project as agents whose moralizing strategy of suasion – or evoking emotions of horror at physical excess like drunkenness – was a less violent and hence less savage alternative to punitive male strategies. Moral reform melodramas like *The Drunkard* and *Uncle Tom's Cabin* used female-coded suasion as an activist strategy. These strategies also occur in melodramas like *Pizarro* or *Mazeppa* in which spectacle was used to establish normalcy through difference. Theatre used spectacles like *delirium tremens* or *Eliza on the ice* was meant to inspire terror and pity in the audience as a way to normalize virtues like sobriety or social equality through dire displays of their opposites. In theatre, normalcy was produced through displays of difference.

Civilization was also seen to be based on equality, which could only be implemented through democratic governance. Because People of Color and women were seen as fundamentally unequal in relation to White men, they needed to be excluded from the electorate. Groups like Blacks and Indians were not just excluded from the State as

social relation but also from the State as territory, Blacks through exclusion and Indians through genocide. Social equality was understood to be based on economic equality. In a region where wealth was mineral based, everyone with territorial access guaranteed an equal opportunity. Because people of color were excluded from the electorate, they also needed to be excluded from the mines. Blacks and Indians posed the two most dire threats to White monopoly in the gold fields. Both were legally constituted in the United States (with regards to Blacks) and California more specifically (with regards to Indians) as enslaveable subjects. Access to slaves would give Whites who came to California and southern Oregon with a preexisting economic advantage the added advantage of people able to profit off of their unpaid labor forces. Indians in particular posed a problem to California capitalism, and the democracy on which it was based, because their territorial bases at the time of the Gold Rush were in the Sierras and Siskiyou – the very geographies with the highest gold yields. They also had a prior claim to the land. Indians from the Bay Area and southern California posed less of a threat both because they had previously been colonized by the Spanish and Mexicans, and because their territory was not so mineral rich. The prior territorial claim by Latinos in California – while contested – was on stronger legal footing through protections guaranteed by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Also, Latino landholders were mostly white. Equality is presented as virtuous time and again in Gold Rush plays like *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, *William Tell*, *Putnam* and *Pizarro*. Threats to democracy are also displayed through pejorative impressions of blackface in minstrel shows, the rendition of the Black Legend of Spanish colonial cruelty enacted in *Pizarro*, and creating pitiable stage Indians who were much whiter than the real Indians living (and dying) in the Gold Rush zone. Further, capitalism

becomes a dominant structure in Gold Rush theatre through the sale of tickets. Where California theatre under Spanish and Mexican occupation, and even in the amateur theatricals put on by the American military, was done by and for the community, theatre in San Francisco and the gold fields during the Gold Rush was done for profit. Mission, Mexican and military theatre was subsidized by theatre makers from other income streams. Gold Rush theatre in San Francisco and the gold fields was self-financing.

Whiteness itself had gradations meant to elevate Anglo-Saxons over other White ethnicities. The primary marker of Anglo-Saxon identity was the English language. This is demonstrated in Gold Rush theatre not only by the preponderance of English-language plays, but by the quantity of plays written in Great Britain. Importing plays from Great Britain by the Anglo-Americans, Germany by the Germans, France by the French, and China by the Chinese reminded the spectators of an Old Country. For emigrants like those from Germany, France and China, the nostalgic effect is clearer than it is for the Anglo-Americans – many of whom never set foot on the British Isles. For Anglo-Americans, emigrant nostalgia was replaced by a reminder that they were both people with a history, and that they were agents of empire.

One of the things this unilinear model makes clear is that it was possible for a subject to move along it. The most dramatic examples were white discomfort with the level of violence required to conquer California, and the Noble Savage. The first demonstrates that those who embodied civilization could “go savage”, while the second shows that those whose social position was literally subsumed by savagery could both embody and enact civilization. The following chapter explores theatrical strategies by

which the mutability of race was confronted in a society that based itself on a stratified racial structure.

CHAPTER III

2018-2019

The Gold Rush is simply one of the sociological-historical events in its region. Another, earlier event – missionization – was touched upon in the previous chapter. Immediately after the Gold Rush, the Civil War resulted in the abolition of Black slavery in the United States. In the 20th century, the military-industrial development associated with World War II led to the migration of both Whites and Blacks from the south to California, while anti-Asian racism led to the removal of Japanese Americans from their homes on the West Coast and internment in rural camps. The Civil Rights Movement resulted in both leftwing People of Color movements like the Black Panther Party as well as nationalist movements like the Chicano Aztlan movement in California (Pulido). White rightwing reaction against the Civil Rights Movement resulted in the election of Reagan, an Orange County conservative, and the inversion of antiracist activism under the presumption that all races are fundamentally equal and so that the idea of reverse racism against Whites would have theoretical cogency (Omi & Winant).

With all this water under the proverbial bridge, the continued valency of the structures initiated by the Gold Rush is questionable. This chapter does not expect to tell the whole story of what has happened between the Gold Rush and the 2018-2019 theatre season. Rather, it seeks to provide clear points of comparisons with the Gold Rush for the comparison in Chapter IV. This chapter seeks to answer that question by proceeding in a manner that mirrors that of the previous chapter.

One of the major differences between 1849-1860 and 2018-2019 is that the racial hierarchy is far less explicitly legislated. In fact, legislation since the Civil Rights Act has

had to be made under the veneer of “equality”. Even reactionary legislation, since the 1980s onwards, has had to have racial equality as its stated goal (Omi & Winant 113). For example, reactionaries cannot object to affirmative action on the basis that it gives People of Color opportunities that had been denied to them. Rather, they must center perceived prejudice against Whites or Asian Americans (Newkirk). Since thinkers and public figures of the current period are not explicitly ranking ethnicities and races by who they think is best, one has to read between the lines to see whether and how such a hierarchy exists. This chapter, therefore, begins with an analysis of regionally specific data on access to political participation and arts engagement as two metrics of group privilege. Both have been used in classic studies of other regions like those of Bourdieu (concerning France) and Bennett et al. (concerning Australia).

This analysis will show that a particular set of Whites have the best access to political participation and arts engagement. As such, this first section correlates to the first section in Chapter II on Anglo-Saxons. It is here that another difficulty in comparing the Gold Rush and the current period arises: not all of the ethnic and racial categories of the Gold Rush have direct corollaries today. For instance, Whiteness is far more consolidated today than it was in the Gold Rush. As the previous chapter demonstrated, Whiteness existed as a legal and administrative tool during the Gold Rush, but its members were determined by a combination of skin-tone and cultural proximity to Anglo-Saxons. Eric Avila’s analysis of racialization in southern California, however, shows that during the suburbanization movement of the mid-20th century, White ethnic differences were tucked away behind residential walls (27-28). By way of another example, Chinese immigrants were the only Asian ethnicity who had established and

insular communities during the Gold Rush. Today, however, they are joined by Japanese, Vietnamese, Cambodian and other communities that are categorized under the umbrella racial terms “Asian” or “Asian American”.

After the first section, which turns out to be about Whites, this chapter proceeds to analyze the relationship between social positioning and theatre of the GRZ’s racial and ethnic groups. Like the previous chapter, each section will begin by illuminating aspects of their social position not covered in the section about racial hierarchy, and then proceed to examples of how those social positions are played out in theatre and other performance venues.

Racial Hierarchy

This section is meant to clarify the racial hierarchy of the 2018-2019 season, since it is less explicitly drawn out than the Gold Rush’s was. To do this, I use two major indicators: political participation and cultural engagement. These are, in part, based upon the previous chapter: part of the creation of Whiteness was the restriction of the rights to vote, to sit on juries, or to testify in a criminal case to people with light skin and from people with dark skin. Cultural engagement was another indicator of higher rungs on the Gold Rush’s racial ladder: all White ethnicities analyzed (Anglo-Saxons, Germans, French and some Latin Americans) had access to theatre both as audiences and as performers, while only two ethnicities restricted from Whiteness (some Latin Americans and Chinese) had such access.

Political Engagement

In working through available statistical data for the 2018-2019 period, we are looking for the group that May identifies as the dominant ethnien or Staatsvolk (95). His

work on linguistic nationalism is foundational here, and generalizable to other aspects of state maintenance like civic and arts engagement. He claims that “[t]he nation-state...*creates* sociological minorities by establishing a civic language and culture that is largely limited to, and representative of the dominant ethnies or Staatsvolk.” The Staatsvolk masks its own ethnic identity with the guise of a “universal” norm (6) or, citing Billig’s *Banal Nationalism*, casts itself as banal or unremarkable. Other ethnic groups are remarkable because of their differences from the Staatsvolk. It is able to enforce its banality through, among other things, language in the company of military might. As May jokingly puts it, the difference between a language and a dialect is that a language has an army and a navy (160). In other words, the accumulation of state power to one group on the basis of race, ethnicity, language and/or culture precedes the creation of groups that are either liminal or completely excluded from the state. It enforces this linguistic monopoly through military interventions (or, in the case of California, paramilitary terror), and uses the language as an indicator of normalcy to justify this violent suppression of other ethnic groups. In the preceding chapter, the “Staatsvolk” was Anglo-Saxons. Liminal groups were Germans, French, Mexicans and other Latin Americans, Chinese, Blacks and Pacific Islanders.

May’s analysis centers language in the construction of race. During the Gold Rush, all of the categories analyzed besides Irish and Blacks spoke a language other than English as their native tongue. It makes sense, therefore, to treat language as a constitutive but not exhaustive component of racialization during the Gold Rush. To track language’s importance today, it makes sense to begin a structural analysis of current day “civilization” in the Gold Rush Zone with that region’s legitimate and institutional

language(s). The short answer is, it is English. The long answer is that “legitimate language” here means the state-sanctioned or official language, while “institutional language” means the language which is “taken for granted” in both official and unofficial contexts (6). California has one official language, and that language is English. The process of establishing English as the official language began in 1855. The 1849 constitution of California provided that all laws would be published in both English and Spanish (Heizer & Almquist 149). During the economic depression of 1855, the California legislature “passed a number of laws that directly or indirectly were aimed at restricting the freedom of Mexican Californian citizens” (151). One of these was the refusal of funds to translate laws into Spanish. In 1986, the electorate of California approved a constitutional amendment by an almost 3:1 margin to make English the official language of California (Pallay). On the other side of the GRZ border, Oregon does not have an official language. In California, 63.6% of American Community Survey respondents only spoke English. In Jackson County, that number is 92.6%, and in Josephine County it is 97.4%. Data are not available for Curry County. A demographic exception to this rule of English monolingualism is speakers of Asian or Pacific Islander languages 65 years old and older in California, only 30.0% of whom claim to speak English “very well” (*Language Spoken At Home*). While multilingualism is clearly more prevalent in California than in Oregon, it still seems to be the primary spoken language based on the above data. As such, proficiency in English would seem to be part of access to the state apparatuses in both California and Oregon.

Having access to state apparatuses, however, does not as a matter of course equal engagement with state apparatuses. Civic engagement is measured here through who is

most likely to vote, based on the importance that early white American Californians gave to establishing an exclusively White and male electorate. According to the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC), likely voters are disproportionately White in California, over “Latinos”, Asian Americans, African Americans, and “others” (Baldassare et al.). Likely voters are also domestic born, 45 years old and older, homeowners, have attended or graduated from college, and have an annual income of \$60,000 per year or more. Language is not a category asked about in the PPIC survey. However, the California Secretary of State provides voting guides not only in English, but also in Spanish, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Khmer, Korean, Tagalog, Thai, and Vietnamese (“Elections and Voter Information”). The Oregon Secretary of State provides registration options in English, Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese, Somali, and Russian (“Oregon Online Voter Registration”). While these options may open access for primary speakers of minority languages, it is unclear as to how this impacts the actual languages spoken by voters. The PPIC model of a most likely voter cannot therefore reliably include language, but it can describe the most likely California voter as a White homeowner older than 45 with access to academic education, property, and a higher income. This most likely voter is also domestic, which does not mean that they primarily speak English (they could be a domestic born Spanish speaker, for instance) but, based on ACS’s data regarding the prevalence of English as a primary language in California, it would not be unreasonable to assume that they do. Since self-identified Whites vote at rates disproportionately higher than Latinxs, it becomes even more likely that English is the California electorate’s dominant language.

Rates of incarceration by race and ethnicity provide a useful counterpoint to language and voting because involves a forced separation from the electorate. It is also tied to policing. Pulido notes that in today's America, police are mobilized in part to protect against perceived racial threats (7). This is borne out by the California Department of Corrections data on prisoner race (Ashley et al.). Blacks represent 28.3% of California's incarcerated population. By comparison, they represent 5.8% of California's general population. The ratio here is 4.9:1. By comparison, Hispanics represent 44.1% of the prison population and 39.3% of the general population, for a ratio of 1.1:1; and whites represent 21.0% of the prison population to 59.5% of the general population, for a ratio of 0.4:1. "Others", meaning "American Indian, Filipino, Asian, and unknown", account for 6.6% of the incarcerated population and 15.5% of the general population, for a ratio of 0.4:1. Domestic-born prisoners make up the bulk (81.6%) of the incarcerated population. Blacks are clearly the hardest hit by incarceration rates, and whites may be the group most benefited here. The "Others" category is not especially helpful: while "black", "white" and "Hispanic" have meanings in other demographic data, this is the only instance in the data reviewed where Asians and American Indians are grouped together. However, the onus of the criminal justice system in California seems to fall disproportionately hard on African Americans.

Thus, a rough approximation of the racial hierarchy in the GRZ as constructed around political engagement would put Whites who are domestic born, 45 years old and older, homeowners, have attended or graduated from college, have an annual income of \$60,000 per year or more, and speak English at the top. Below them would come the balance of the White, anglophonic population, as well as "American Indians, Filipinos,

Asians, and unknown” (regarding incarceration). Next might come people whose primary language is not English but is one of the others accommodated by either the California or Oregon Secretary of State. At the bottom might come Blacks, people whose first language is not accommodated by either Secretary of State, and undocumented immigrants.

Cultural Engagement

While hiring People of Color to act at a theatre like the Oregon Shakespeare Festival in Jackson County may seem racially progressive, it does nothing to change the underlying causes of White habitus in the region. The most visible representatives of racial difference – actors, playwrights, and directors – are brought in on a show-by-show basis. Rather than dismantling White hegemony, this may only reinforce it. Sometimes actors are hired season after season, but there is no guarantee that will happen.

“White habitus” is primarily a function of geography here. Looking at the University of Virginia’s Racial Dot Map ([The Racial Dot Map: One Dot Per Person for the Entire U.S. \(coopercenter.org\)](http://www.coopercenter.org)), monolithically White populations seem to be concentrated through the Sierra Nevadas and in Medford and Ashland, Oregon. In other words, centers of White homogeny roughly correspond to the 1850s gold fields. These centers look like a tail on a band of blue (the University of Virginia’s color-code for Whites) with its body around Portland and Seattle. The urban history of “white flight” is addressed in studies of Los Angeles (Avila, Pulido), but this map shows something far more regional. First, it reflects the effort made by White settlers during the Gold Rush to secure sites of mineral wealth for themselves, as well as efforts in the Oregon Territory to exclude non-Whites (Barman and Watson 137 for Blacks, Beckham 438-446 for

termination of Oregon tribes which dispersed Indians from reservations). While the historical factors involved are telling, the minuteness with which the urban histories treat this phenomenon help better understand the creation of White identity.

The ramifications of white flight on other racial groups will be profiled later in this chapter, so for now the focus will be on White Angelenos. Of importance is the development of the suburbs. After World War II, real estate boomed in Los Angeles with the influx of both White and Black newcomers from the American South. During this boom, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation categorized neighborhoods by color: neighborhoods that were "highly protected by deed restrictions" and with "homogenous" populations coded green. If those neighborhoods were within a short distance of "even a few black families", they were coded blue. Neighborhoods with an "infiltration" of Jews, "Mexicans and Japs" were coded yellow. Those fourth-grade neighborhoods with even a small number of Blacks were coded red (Avila 35). This race-based approach to home loans allowed and encouraged White families to the suburbs and restricted Blacks and, to a lesser degree, "Russian" Jews (36), Mexicans and Japanese to the urban core. The suburbs promoted privacy of the nuclear family onto discrete lots of land and, in Los Angeles, the commute in which the privacy of an individual automobile displaces the public environment of the streetcar (Avila Chapter 6). Avila also shows how the cultural sector encouraged privatization of the commons through case studies of Disneyland and the Dodgers Stadium. The paradigms for group organization encouraged and strengthened by white flight were the heterosexual nuclear family, corporate consumption and – of course – Whiteness.

This geographic isolation of Whites in the Sierras, Medford and Ashland also provides rich soil for White habitus. The palimpsest of current racial residential patterns in the 1850s gold fields is a key component to this habitus since one of the three “fundamental dimensions” of the space in which habitus is constructed, according to Bourdieu, is “the change in [volume of capital and composition of capital] over time (manifested by past and potential trajectories in social space” (114). As shown in the preceding chapter, Gold Rush Whites used legal and extralegal violence in order to establish White dominance over the mineral resources in the Sierras and the Siskiyou. The Racial Dot Map demonstrates that, even though mineral extraction is no longer an essential economic enterprise in those regions, the racial homogeny enforced during the Gold Rush persists. “Capital”, for Bourdieu, means a “set of actually usable resources and powers” – in this case, real estate. It is this sort of exclusive control of a broad geography that gives rise to what Bonilla-Silva calls “white habitus”. By residentially segregating themselves from other races, Whites create “a situation that severely limits close personal relationships between blacks and whites,” and so “whites’ collective experiences with blacks are extremely limited and based on racial stereotypes and generalizations perpetuated by the media or through other second-hand sources” (232). Because Whites in the Sierras and Siskiyou typically only experience other White people on a day-to-day basis, their expectations of other races are liable to be formed by second-hand stereotypes. What relationships they do have with Blacks, or really People of Color in general, are liable to be overstated, as seen in Bonilla-Silva et al. So, while hiring People of Color to act at a theatre like the Oregon Shakespeare Festival in Jackson

County may seem racially progressive, it does nothing to change the underlying causes of White habitus in the region.

The impact is the commodification of racial difference, a sort of phenomenon described by Maira with regards to henna tattoos (2002) and belly-dancing (2008). Her first article, on henna tattoos, uses Northampton, Massachusetts as the geographic site of enquiry. She argues that that geography is important because, “Given the homogenous population of Northampton, cultural and racial difference often enters a packaged, if not exoticized, difference” (142). Her second article is based on interviews primarily of Bay Area participants in belly dance. She argues here “that liberal multiculturalism has attempted to respond to the racial profiling of Arabs and Muslims through ‘culture talk,’ focusing on cultural and religious difference and evading the U.S. state’s political, economic, and military interventions in the Middle East. Within this liberal multicultural framework, rejecting racism involves ‘respect’ for cultural difference, often proven through symbolic performances and the consumption of cultural commodities” (327). In both cases, primarily White consumers use their role in capitalism as consumers to resist anti-Arab racism by buying tokens of acceptance. Her demographic description of Northampton evokes Ashland’s racial homogeneity where the community is mostly White, and symbols of racial difference are consumed in a capitalist marketplace. An aspect of Northampton that also evokes Ashland but which Maira does not delve as deeply into is that the primarily White consumers of racial difference come from out of town. Northampton is a college town; the Oregon Shakespeare Festival is a tourist destination. Sufficient data is not available on the communities of origin for Northampton students and OSF patrons, so it is unclear whether they are visiting from other racially

homogenous communities or from more diverse communities. Wherever they come from, the places to which they are going are predominantly White but also places where they can purchase pre-packaged experiences evocative of racial difference. While the initial impulse, following Maira, seems like a benign attempt to eschew racism, the capitalist channels through which those impulses are funneled lead to the commodification and tokenization of People of Color and their cultures.

In spite of the spectacle of color on Gold Rush Zone stages, theatre is dominated by Whites. Race in theatre, however, is disappointingly under-studied, which means we need to take fairly circuitous route to get there. Bourdieu, in *Distinction*, does some of the first sociology that points in this direction. He is interested in the “hierarchy of legitimacies” with which the arts world is endowed (88). This hierarchy is structured around how much “cultural capital” each type of art bestows upon its participants. Artistic types receive their value from the class of participants. “High-society” is the best determiner of which arts are and are not “legitimate”. The classes with the best access to “legitimate” art are “artistic producers” and “higher-education teachers” (90). Bennett et al., in their reapplication of Bourdieu’s study to their 1990s Australian community redefine Bourdieu’s notions of legitimacy and high-society as “restricted” art (116). The polar opposite of “restricted” art is “inclusive” art. Bennett et al.’s terminology is meant to emphasize that Bourdieu’s “legitimate” art is restricted in its audience to a few classes, whereas popular art is just that – more open to all class categories.

Using the best available arts attendance data for the Gold Rush Zone in the 2010s, we can construct a table of publicly funded arts by restriction to inclusivity. Table 1 shows data that come from the 2017 *SPPA*:

Table 1

Publicly Funded Art from Restrictive to Inclusive

Medium	Percentage of California Respondents Who Experienced Said Art in the Last 12 Months
Live opera performance	3.6
Live ballet performance	4.2
Read any plays	5.5
Live dance (non-ballet) performance	7.3
Live Latin, Spanish, or salsa music program	9.3
Live jazz performance	9.5
Live nonmusical stage play	10.3
Live classical music performance	11.3
Read any poetry	13.4
Read any graphic novels or books in comic strip format	13.4
Some other live music/dance/theatre performance	14.1
Live musical stage play	17.5
Listened to any audiobooks	21.2
Crafts fair or visual arts festival	24.1
Outdoor festival that featured performing artists	25.7
Art exhibit	27.8
Historic park or monument or tour of a building/neighborhood for historic design	31.2

Table 1 continued

Medium	Percentage of California Respondents Who Experienced Said Art in the Last 12 Months
Read any nonfiction books about science or technology	31.8
Art museum or gallery	32.3
Fair/festival featuring crafts, visual or performing arts	40.6
Read any nonfiction books about history	44.5
Read any novels or short stories	46.1
Read any biographies	46.1
Read any religious texts or books about religion or spirituality	46.3
Read any books	54.8

Source: National Endowment for the Arts

The first notable thing about these data is that the publicly funded arts are, as a whole, restricted in California: the only thing that is experienced by more than half of the population is books in general. Within that restrictedness, some things are more inaccessible than others. The most restricted things are the performing arts, which are generally events that happen during a very specific moment in time. The exceptions here are music programs like jazz and Latin, Spanish or salsa music which may start at a certain time but at which patrons can arrive at any time. This most restricted category also includes play scripts, poetry, and graphic novels. The least restricted of this performing arts category are live musical plays. The least restricted publicly funded arts overall are books besides scripts, poetry, and graphic novels. Their relative inclusivity

can be ascribed to their mode of consumption: a person can read a book most anywhere. The inclusive genres are religious texts, biographies, novels or short stories, and history nonfiction. The intermediately restricted category mostly involves site-specific events that can be experienced over a broad range of time. For instance, a person can visit a historic neighborhood at any time, but they still have to go there. A museum may have posted operating hours, but those usually involve the better part of the normal workday. This intermediate group also includes STEM nonfiction books.

Neither Bourdieu nor Bennett et al. fully address the role of race in arts access, which is the predominant focus of this dissertation. Even had they, their data would not be terribly useful here since they were looking at France in the 1960s and Australia in the 1990s, not the Gold Rush Zone today. Unfortunately, the *SPPA* is of little more use. Of the California respondents, the only sample size large enough with a 95% confidence interval is that of White Only ($N \approx 550$). Even if we look at the United States as a whole, the sample sizes are only large enough for White Only ($N \approx 7200$) and Black Only ($N \approx 880$).

Since no racial data help us to describe arts attendance by race, perhaps a more circuitous route through class may be helpful. This route is suggested by Bourdieu's (90) and Bennett et al.'s (262) observations that workers in cultural production like artists and teachers have the greatest cultural capital. Table 2 illustrates which race(s) dominate and which are underrepresented in arts participation. The following table describes arts attendance by occupation, and is based on *SPPA* data. It is arranged in descending order: from the occupations with the highest arts attendance to those with the least in California.

Table 2

Arts Attendance by Occupation in California

Occupation	Percent arts consumption in the past 12 months
Arts, design, entertainment, sports & media	38.3
Education, training & library	37.8
Business & financial operations	33.5
Healthcare practitioner	28.1
Food prep & serving	24.6
Management	24.5
Legal	24.3
Architecture & engineering	22.4
Personal care & service	22.2
Office & administrative support	21.9
Installation, maintenance & repair	21.4
Sales	20.0
Life, physical & social science	19.0
Computer & mathematical sciences	18.7
Protective services	17.2
Healthcare support	15.7
Farming, fishing & forestry	14.2
Production	14.2
Transportation & material moving	13.2
Community & social	12.5

Table 2 continued

Occupation	Percent arts consumption in the past 12 months
Building & grounds cleaning & maintenance	10.9
Construction & extraction	9.1

Source: National Endowment for the Arts

These data align with those described by Bourdieu and Bennett et al., where those who work in the arts and education have the most access to cultural capital in the form of arts attendance.

To finish this process of coming at the racial composition of arts participants from the side, Table 3.3 shows the racial composition of Californians in arts, design, entertainment, sports and media professions; and education, training and library professions. The totals will add up to more than 100%, because the Hispanic and Latino category overlaps with other categories.

These data show that Whites overwhelmingly occupy classes with the greatest cultural capital, measured by arts participation. Those numbers are augmented by the inclusion of Latinx Whites. Latinxs without a racial attribution in this data set come in for a distant second, with Asians third. American Indians, Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders have next to no cultural capital, so measured. Discounting Indigenous Latinxs, who are not specified in these data, the negligible group exhausts all other racial categories describing the United States' Indigenous peoples. Blacks, those describing themselves as "some other race", and those identifying as mixed race are minimally represented in the 5-8% range. These data show the largest divides between Whites, People of Color, and Indigenous Peoples in terms of cultural capital.

Table 3

Racial Composition in California Professions with Highest Arts Attendance

	Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media occupations (<i>N</i> = 570,652)	Education instruction, and library occupations (<i>N</i> = 1,068,518)	Percentage of overall civilian employed population 16 years or older (<i>N</i> = 19,078,101)
White alone	69.3%	69.1%	59.5%
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino	57.9%	51.9%	37.5%
Black alone	5.4%	5.2%	5.3%
American Indian/Alaska Native alone	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%
Asian alone	12.8%	12.3%	16.1%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander alone	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%
Some other race alone	6.1%	7.8%	14.0%
Two or more races	5.5%	4.7%	4.1%
Hispanic or Latino	19.5%	27.2%	38.0%

Source: American Community Survey, 2019, Table B24010

Data on film and TV participation, however, suggests a different phenomenon with similar results. These data are important because, as described by Motion Pictures Association, 76% of the population of the United States and Canada are moviegoers (Jenks 27). Their data are not presented state-by-state and province-by-province, but, unless California and southern Oregon are outliers, they show that the movies are much

more inclusive than any of the publicly subsidized art forms. Available data for the U.S. and Canada also explicitly describe movie audiences: they are disproportionately attended by Latinxs (Jenks 30, Hunt et al. 7) and Asians (Hunt et al. 7) and under-attended by Whites (Jenks 30, Hunt et al. 7). People of Color are more likely to see movies with racially diverse casts than Whites (Hunt et al. 35). However, Hollywood struggles to come to grips with this market imperative: Whites get 69.1% of all film roles, followed by Blacks at a distant second with 14.9%. Middle Easterners and North Africans and Natives (meaning global Indigenous Peoples here) come in last at 0.7% and 0.3% respectively (13). Hunt et al. attribute this to the overwhelming Whiteness of studio leadership CEOs are 91% White, senior executives are 93% White, and unit heads are 86% White (9).

This is not to say that those numbers are better descriptors of theatre than the circuitous route taken above through NEA and ACS data: theatre, for instance, has a more restricted audience than film. Rather, this is to say that both White people seem to dominate arts production and seem to dominate arts consumption for more restricted media that are – incidentally – publicly funded. Inclusive art, while dominated by Whites, is attended at higher rates by Latinxs and Asians specifically and People of Color in general. Production is also funded on an entirely earned-income basis. However, the racial makeup of theatre audiences needs far more research than it has so far received.

With the data available, however, it seems possible to sketch a racial hierarchy with regards to cultural engagement. Non-Hispanic Whites have far and above the most access to the cultural sector. They are followed by non-Indigenous People of Color. Finally, Indigenous Peoples (meaning here American Indians, Alaska Natives, Native

Hawaiians, and Other Pacific Islanders) have very little access to the cultural sector. This comes with a fairly large caveat: not every medium is created equal with regards to accessibility. Here to a hierarchy exists from media that are restricted, most likely to the group with the highest cultural capital, to those that are inclusive. The most restricted media are the time-based performing arts like theatre, opera, and ballet. They are followed by live events that are not time-based like visits to museums, fairs, or historic monuments. These are followed by books, which, when described in general as opposed to topic, cross over into inclusive art. Finally, TV and film constitute inclusive media. Thus, it would seem that People of Color generally and Indigenous Peoples in particular have a high bar to hurdle when it comes to participation in the theatre. The balance of this chapter is devoted to some of the strategies these groups use to negotiate this bar in the context of their general social positioning.

Hispanic or Latino

Social position

The U.S. Census uses the Office of Management and Budget definition that “Hispanic or Latino” refers to “a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race.” (“About Hispanic Origin”) It is not, therefore, a racial category but rather an ethnic one corresponding with Spain’s historic sphere of imperialism. It is also conceived of as a foreign category: the locations of culture and origin listed above all refer to non-American states except for Puerto Rico which, as a territory, has not been fully incorporated into the civic processes of the U.S. This emphasis on foreignness informs the social position of Latinxs in the current Gold Rush Zone, and dates as far back as the

Foreign Miners Tax being selectively enforced against Latin Americans and Chinese in 1855 (Heizer & Almquist 151).

This ascribed foreignness, currently in the shape of ICE targeting Latin Americans, flies in the face of Mexican Americans constituting a national minority in California, where they were present with an independent state structure prior to Americanization. As we saw in the last chapter, however, the Latinx population in California was not limited to the Californio community. They were joined, and in many cases grouped with, immigrants from Mexico, Peru, and Chile. Immigration, especially from Mexico, continued in the 20th century. The southern focus of this population carries over from the Gold Rush to the current period. This demographic is centered on LA with a tail reaching up the Central Valley and scattering down to the Mexican border (Racial Dot Map). During the outmigration from Los Angeles's urban core during the mid-20th century, Mexican Americans moved the least. However, Pulido (xxxix) shows some movement from San Fernando south and from the urban core east. Even today, the swath of Latinx orange extends from the Black neighborhoods noted above east to San Bernadino and another pocket in the San Fernando area.

White foreignizing of Latin Americans has historically prevented meaningful alliances between those two populations. Instead, Latin Americans in California have historically sought alliances with other People of Color. In Oxnard during the sugar beet boom in the early 20th century, the Mexican section of town was called "Sonoratown" (Almaguer 187). As People of Color, they were at best held at arm's length by organized labor. AFL refusal to charter the Japanese-Mexican Labor Association during the latter's disputes with growers in Ventura County in 1903. Their explicit position to exclude

Japanese labor on anti-immigration grounds threatened to split the JMLA (201). Interestingly, the AFL was prepared to charter the Mexican branch of the JMLA. They were casting Asian laborers as antagonists to White workers, a binary in which the AFL deemed Mexicans as White – or at least White enough. The Mexican branch of the JMLA, however, chose to stand in solidarity with the Japanese branch instead of splitting off to join the AFL. During the 1960s and 1970s, however, the Latinx farmworker community in California was effectively split between citizen and documented noncitizens, and undocumented immigrants and migrants. The United Farm Workers were rumored to have gone so far as to call INS on undocumented strike-breakers in Coachella Valley (Sifuentes 54). Whether or not the UFW actually snitched, it is documented that their members blocked immigrant buses from crossing the border by lying on the road at Roma, Texas and organized with the Confederacion de Trabajadores Mexicanos to keep undocumented workers on the Mexican side of the border (66). As in Oregon, California Latinxs have accreted a liminal image as maybe-White but probably POC, maybe-American but probably not. Social actors have chosen how they want to walk those lines by choosing with which groups they want to stand in solidarity and which they want to exclude.

Latin Americans do not constitute a national minority in Oregon. At the beginning of World War II, Mexican Americans accounted for a mere 11,000 people across Oregon, Idaho, and Washington (Sifuentes 3). They were joined during the war years by agricultural laborers under the bracero program, a bilateral agreement between the United States and Mexico to host guest workers to compensate for the dearth of U.S. citizen laborer (1). The program lasted into the 1960s, and in “1957 Oregon received the sixth-

most migrants of any state in the country, behind California, Texas, Michigan, New York, and Florida” (27). They were joined by relocating Tejanos from the 1950s into the 1980s. In addition, the Latinx population includes undocumented migrants, who become the focus of nativist anxieties and serve as stand-ins for all Latinxs. During the 1970s, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) engaged in a number of highly visible raids of workplaces suspected to employ undocumented laborers each resulting in multiple detentions and deportations. These highly disruptive and predatory activities were accompanied by a rhetorical strategy differentiating between undocumented immigrants and the U.S. citizens from whom they were “taking jobs”. The gaps in the labor supply left by INS, however, were rarely filled by U.S. citizens (70). INS’s performance merged corporeal terror, reminiscent of that visited on Latin American, Chinese, and Indigenous communities during the Gold Rush, with a hero-narrative that positioned INS agents as the defenders of an overstated class of U.S. citizen agricultural laborers against non-citizen agricultural laborers. They targeted and participated in the creation of internecine class conflict on the basis of nationality in which those who were documented by the United States were “legal” and those who were unrecognized or undocumented by the United States were “illegal”. The terrorism aspect of INS’s performance is part of an overarching settler colonial project in which Latinxs are subject to control as “undesirable exogenous others” (Glenn 62). This terror is incomplete, however, without the narrative in which Latinxs are foreign villains victimizing American citizens between whom stands only the coercive arm of the State. This antagonism which defines the American State’s protagonism is apparent in Donald Trump’s inaugurating his 2016 presidential campaign by claiming that “When Mexico

sends its people, they're not sending their best... They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people" (*Donald Trump Presidential Campaign Announcement Full Speech (C-SPAN)*). A border does not exist without somebody on the other side of it in as represented as somebody of another nationality (Menon 34). In Oregon, where there is no international border, highly visible persecutions of designated foreigners confirm the presence of the American State. The border makes America, and INS raids enact the border for Oregonians.

On stage

TCG's Theatre Profiles portal ([Theatre Profiles \(tcg.org\)](http://TheatreProfiles(tcg.org))) lists 9 theatres with a "Special Interest" in "Latino/Hispanic" theatre for the 2018-2019 season. These theatres are 24th Street Theatre, Berkeley Repertory Theatre, Center Theatre Group, Marin Theatre Company, New Village Arts Theatre, The Pasadena Playhouse, PCPA – Pacific Conservatory Theatre, San Diego Repertory Theatre, and Skylight Theatre Company. Oregon Shakespeare Festival is not included on the Oregon list, which has only one entry – *Milagro* in Portland. However, both of the "Latino/Hispanic" plays profiled below were produced by OSF.

The plays I saw in field work for this project that told stories about what it means to be Latinx both embrace this liminality and uneasy identification by focusing on migration as well as upon ancestral and citizenship allegiances to Mexico. I saw Octavio Solis' *Mother Road* at the Oregon Shakespeare Festival, in their Angus Bowmer Theatre, on March 17, 2019. *Mother Road* is a sequel to Steinbeck's *Grapes of Wrath* about William Joad's (played by Mark Murphey) road trip along Route 66 from California to

Oklahoma with his relative and the only other surviving Joad, Martín Jodes (Tony Sancho). Joad is dying of cancer, and he wants his land to stay in his family, so he and Jodes are returning there. Towards the end of the play, Joad, Jodes, Mo (Amy Lizardo) and James (Cedric Lamar) disinter the bones of William James Joad. They are interrupted by three ranch hands (Jeffrey King, Armando Durán and Fidel Gomez). Gomez's character, Curtis, shoots Joad. King and Durán's characters flee, but Curtis stays to help – he does not like that he just mortally wounded somebody. He explains that he is Choctaw, and that he thought the four of them were grave robbers stealing Choctaw remains. The spectacle here is the lethal violence used by Curtis against Joad. Curtis's Indigenous identity shifts the narrative. At first, we think that his motivations are as White ranch worker protecting his land from four outsiders, three of whom (Jodes, Mo and James) are People of Color. The narrative shifts when we learn about Curtis's true motivation that he is keeping secret from his coworkers out of fear of outing himself as Indian to White strangers. We only learn about his race after the spectacle, though. What we interpret in the moment is a White man shooting another White man in the presence of the victim's comrades of color and the shooter's White comrades. Because Joad does not die until later, the spectacle is not one of death but rather of killing. Killing, then, is the social aberration. A racialized norm is being established here through its spectacular opposite, where White men are not the aggressors in conflicts between them and People of Color, and where they certainly do not target their violence against other White men. This norm is confirmed when Curtis exposes himself as not White. Solis's spectacle, then, normalizes the idea of men of color as racial threats. This is a component of the socially constructed "savage", as we will see below. Because savagery is the absence of

civilization, or its self-constitutive Other, civilization is normalized here as nonviolent and White.

This playing into a stereotype of Men of Color conflicts with part of the purpose of *Mother Road*. By making a Chicano campesino the rightful heir of the Joad land in Oklahoma, Solis is arguing against the foreignness that is ascribed to Chicanxs, and which feeds xenophobic violence like that enacted by ICE. This domesticity is emphasized in Act II by the hotel owner Abelardo (Armando Durán) who refuses to rent a room to William Joad because of an ancestral hostility to White Oklahomans. He tells William and Martín that

One day, I'm an eighth grader doing a report on the Dust Bowl and the Okies and the hard times they had. And my father who corrected all my papers read my report. He just stared at the pages and the vein in his forehead bulged like a bolt of lightning and that was when he said: *A mi no me gustan los Oklahomas*. And I go *¿Porque, Apa?* ... He goes, *Abelardo*, before you were born your mother and me and all the other poor *Mejicanos*, we worked at the sawmill. We built crates for the fruit orchards of California. We made hardly enough to live on, but we worked hard for every *centavo* we made...But that was the time of the Okies. On their way to *Califas*, they used to camp outside of town and the *Patrón*, he watched out for them real good. He gave them work so they could have a little *feria* for their food and *gasolina* for the trip west...But they were *our* jobs! Our *pinche* jobs! He goes, the *Patrón* laid us off for days, weeks, without pay and not a word of sorry or nothing. We're starving, living like beggars, waiting for the *Oklahomas* to leave so we can get our jobs back. (Solis 70-71)

Here Solis lays out a historic injustice that calls for correction. The way in which he provides this correction is through Abelardo relenting and renting William a room, which received a round of applause from the mostly White-presenting audience at the production I saw (on 17 March 2019). The onus for healing, then falls open those whose communities were harmed. The healing happens through naming the harm done, and then letting it go. However, if the audience reaction on March 17th was any indication, the

healing that is done is done for representatives of the community that did the harm. The healing for which *Mother Road* advocates is forgiveness for historic wrongs and lack of accountability for current beneficiaries from those historic wrongs, together with the need for Men of Color to be sedate and not take justice into their own hands. This view of healing is not paradoxical to them of Chicanx belonging in the United States, but rather provides another layer to the play that Solis wrote and that OSF produced.

The Oregon Shakespeare Festival has, as of the 2019 season, made a radical attempt to engage more directly with its local community. *La Comedia of Errors*, a bilingual English and Spanish adaptation of Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors* by Lydia G. Garcia and Bill Rauch based on a modern English translation by Christina Anderson, played at multiple venues in southern Oregon both on and off the OSF campus. On-campus, *La Comedia* played in the black-box Thomas Theatre and in the Hay-Patton Rehearsal Hall. Off-campus, it played in the Eagle Point City Hall, the Medford Public Library, Jackson County Health and Human Services, and 15 other venues. This endeavor continues Rauch's work at Cornerstone Theater Company in Los Angeles. Cornerstone began as a traveling ensemble initiated by Rauch and Alison Carey that developed work with rural communities across the United States before settling in Los Angeles in 1992 where they began to develop work with Angeleno Black and Latinx communities with multi-year cycles of plays. Both OSF and Cornerstone utilize community partners or "ambassadors" to engage help develop relationships between the theatre and communities of interest, and have staff positions devoted to cultivating and maintaining these relationships. Artistic personnel, however, are usually sourced from within a loose nation-wide network of professional artists. For instance, Cornerstone's

past two Native plays, *Urban Rez* and *Native Nation*, have both been done in collaboration with Native communities in Los Angeles and Phoenix, respectively, but written by Larissa FastHorse, a nationally prominent Lakota playwright based in Santa Monica. *La Comedia* page on the OSF website lists 12 community dramaturgs, but direction and playwrighting were done by vetted OSF artists (“A Community Hosted Experience”).

La Comedia of Errors highlights the relationship between civic theatre and language in a way that other plays of the same ilk have not. Its genesis began with the Play on! Shakespeare translation project, a commissioning program by OSF financed by the Hitz Foundation. Earlier in 2019 it formally separated from OSF as its own 501(c)3 called Play On Shakespeare. Former OSG Literary Manager Lue Douthit has managed the project since its inception and currently serves as Play On Shakespeare’s Executive Director. By way of full disclosure, I have been the dramaturg for Yvette Nolan’s translations of *Henry IV Part 1* and *Part 2*. The Hitz Foundation is a charitable organization funded by Silicon Valley entrepreneur Dave Hitz with the goal of making Shakespeare linguistically accessible. The presumption is that no one understands Shakespeare’s language 100% of the time. This is doubly true of Shakespeare in production, where the audience does not have the luxury of being able to revisit a passage or check the footnotes. Play On’s goal is to crack open the text by translating sticky text into language which is easier for our ears to understand without losing the integrity of Shakespeare’s prose and poetry. The Hitz Foundation was the primary sponsor of *La Comedia*, which extends that mission of linguistic accessibility to southern Oregon

residents who are monolingual in Spanish while maintaining accessibility to monolingual Anglophone audience members.

In this adaptation, Ephesus is the United States and Syracuse is Mexico. Egeon (Armando Durán) is a Mexican merchant whose Mexico-Canada flight crashes, leaving him stranded in the hostile United States. Whereas the conflict in *The Comedy of Errors* is structured around mistaken identity and a race against the clock, *La Comedia of Errors* introduces a heavy in the person of Sheriff Solinus (Jeffrey King). The Duke in *The Comedy of Errors* feels himself constrained by his own laws and by enmity with Syracuse, whose Duke's power is equal to that of Duke Solinus of Ephesus (1.1.4-6). Sheriff Solinus, on the other hand, is a menacing presence, leaning into the asymmetry between the United States and Mexico. Here the adaptation is loose: in *La Comedia* and *The Comedy*, Egeon's predicament is an accident of the weather. In real life, Mexican immigrants are not accidentally stranded but instead migrating to a country that has done better at capitalism than their own, and where they are then subjected to violence and threats of violence both by law enforcement and by private citizens. It is this reality, which is absent in the text of the play, that gives Sheriff Solinus his menace. This menace was clear even to the predominately White presenting audience at the performance I attended who hissed at the Sheriff and at Border Patrol (played by the ensemble). As it turned out, the adaptation did not need to be referentially tight in spelling out the threat of law enforcement: simply presenting the signs was enough to get the message across, even to an audience who probably did not have anything to worry about from that direction.

Asian

Social position

Based on the Racial Dot Map, the two most intense clusters of Asian population are in San Jose, Fremont, and San Francisco; and south San Gabriel and south of Anaheim. This comprises Alameda, Los Angeles, Orange, San Francisco, and Santa Clara Counties. According to the 2010 Census, Chinese (excepting Taiwanese) are the most populous Asian ethnic group in all these counties besides Orange, where they are a distant second to Vietnamese. Japanese account for 4.4% of the Asian population in Alameda County, 9.0% in Los Angeles County, 7.8% in Orange County, 5.1% in San Francisco County and 5.7% in Santa Clara County. Despite accounting for low fractions of the overall Asian American population in the Gold Rush Zone's five most Asian counties, Japanese have cultivated a high level of visibility. Sometimes, however, those cultivating that visibility are Japanese born in Japan and not Japanese Americans. Lai describes the development of the Japanese Cultural and Trade Center (now called the Japan Center Malls) with help from Japanese investors. Lai describes the Center as "Disney-esque" (158) in its glitzy and commodified presentation of Japanese culture. He describes how it was part of a White San Franciscan-driven redevelopment of the pathologized Fillmore district, which was predominantly occupied by Japanese and Blacks, and how there was no corresponding monumentalizing or commodification of Black culture. This difference highlights not only the differing racialization of Japanese and Blacks, but also – on account of the Japanese investors – the importance of Japanese money to San Francisco. While Japan was a burgeoning economy during the development of the JCTC in the 1960s, there was no corresponding Black economic

incentive. Part of the reason that White developers and public leaders are interested in celebrating the culture of countries like Japan (or China or India) is that those countries are major U.S. trading partners. While these celebrations may involve Asian money, and even Asian or Asian American personnel, they are still Orientalized spectacles that “[tease] with the possibility of voyeuristic sampling of culture and also simultaneously [reassure] visitors that such a sampling would not be dangerous or entirely foreign” (162). In other words, the Orientalist celebrations provide a “window” into Asian life. This voyeurism entails seeing Asians as foreign, even if they are “two or three generations removed from emigration” (166). The JCTC’s rechristening as a “Mall” highlights the commodification of culture involved in this project. That said, it is not entirely exploitive: the Mall’s website’s Community page links to the Japantown Merchants Association and the Japanese Cultural and Community Center of Northern California which “strives to meet the evolving needs of the Japanese American community through offering programs, affordable services and facility usage” (“Community”). While the Orientalist history and present exist, the Japan Center seems to take its community obligations seriously.

The Union Center for the Arts in Los Angeles, which houses East West Players, provides one of the most complex examples of neoclassical architecture with regards to racial identity, is the Union Center for the Arts in Los Angeles. East West Players’ mission is to raise “the visibility of the Asian American experience by presenting inventive world-class theatrical productions, developing artists of color, and providing impactful youth education programs” (“About”). The Union Center for the Arts was built as Union Church in 1923 to house Japanese American congregations in Los Angeles

(“Union Center for the Arts”). It is located at the edge of the Little Tokyo district, which is also home to the Japanese American Cultural & Community Center (JACCC). In contrast to East West Players, which presents non-musical plays and musicals loosely tied together by the theme of Asian American identity, the JACCC presents a variety of performing, visual, and culinary arts meant to be representative of Japanese culture. The Union Church passed into African American hands in the wake of Japanese American internment and the Great Migration, but was rendered “unusable” during the 1994 Northridge earthquake. The Little Tokyo Service Center Community Development Corporation renovated the building in 1998 to serve as an arts center housing East West Players, Visual Communications and LA Artcore. Visual Communications is an Asian American/Pacific Islander focused film nonprofit, and LA Artcore is a racially undefined visual arts gallery space. The Union Center for the Arts, then, focuses on arts presentation and production, with a tendency towards arts dealing with Asian American identity. Its historic building and proximity to Little Tokyo emphasize the space’s racial identity. However, the Union Church was built with a neoclassical façade featuring four Ionic columns supporting a gable evocative of Greco-Roman architecture. Above it all stands a large stone cross. The Union Center for the Arts is historically tied to the Japanese American community in Los Angeles, but its architecture ties that community to imaginings and identifications with Roman empire. This connection, however, may be accidental. There was little reason for Japanese Americans to identify themselves with whites or to cultivate a “model minority” stereotype before World War II. If anything, they identified more closely with Mexicans and Mexican Americans as demonstrated by Almaguer in his case study of the unionization drive by Japanese and Mexican

Americans in southern California in 1903. Almaguer illustrates a racial landscape in which Japanese and Mexican Americans band together to motivate for living wages for their common agricultural labor in an organizational structure which prioritized and rewarded white labor over that of People of Color. While the beet farmers' strike about which he writes happened in Oxnard, it was covered unfavorably in the *Los Angeles Times*, which described "agitation-crazed striking Mexicans and Japanese" being led by "loud-mouthed and lawless union agitators" (195). While the invective was more skewed against the Mexican membership of the Japanese-Mexican Labor Association, the "peaceable" Japanese were also held to be led astray by union leadership. The Angeleno press's attacks against Oxnard Japanese is salient since Los Angeles was one of the Japanese hubs of California (184). The success of the JMLA's strike was one of the events that precipitated the Alien Land Laws of 1913 and 1920, in which immigrants of color were prohibited from owning land (186). Within this context, neoclassical architecture might make sense as an attempt at respectability – whites might be less likely to vandalize a church that evoked their own ideas of what constitutes a church – than as an appropriation of an imperial identity. This aligns with the observation of Reverend Takayuki Kato of the Shin Buddhist Temple in Little Tokyo that "part [of the reason Buddhist parents did not want to force their religion on their children] is that they went through World War Two, and so that they saw, they experienced the discrimination. They experienced this desire to become American, as American as possible. And they saw, like friends who came out of the camps, and decided right then and there that they were going to be Christian...Just because they wanted to be American and accepted" (cited in Smith 398). In other words, neoclassical architecture by Japanese Americans during the early

20th century is more likely imitating Americanness than Romanness. The connection to the Roman Empire is vicarious; and the connection to American empire is more likely as junior partners than as imperialists in their own right. The Union Center for the Arts executes a Japanese American claim over the space in context of both its history and its location alongside Little Tokyo.

These structures exhibit different negotiations of the foreignness that Asians and Asian Americans have had imposed upon them since the Gold Rush. The previous chapter noted how both Irish and Jews benefited from the focus on Chinese immigrants as foreign, which allowed them better access to the benefits of Whiteness. In 1882, Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act. During World War II, Japanese Americans living on the West Coast were held in prison camps. As Shimakawa notes, the internment camps represented a significant departure from exclusion and deportation. Instead of ejecting the Japanese as undesirable foreigners, as was done to the Chinese in the late 19th century, Japanese were moved further into the American interior (10). She understands this through the lens of Kristevan abjection, where the abject both disturbs the subjectivity or self-identity of the subject while being nonejectable (1-2). This places antiabjection Asian and Asian American activists in an uneasy place between claiming Americanness through an “indigenization” model of identity (which, true to American form, displaces and erases the actual Indigenes) or claiming one’s site of ethnic origin. It seems that an Asian or Asian American cannot have it both ways (132).

On stage

This social positioning reflects a communication with and surveillance of White Americans that is haunted by the history of exclusion and internment and the cognizance

that a wave of xenophobia could result in something similar again. Asian American theatre shows this same outward focus with a handful of telling looks inward towards their own communities.

TCG lists 8 theatres in California with an “Asian-American” special interest. These are Berkeley Repertory Theatre, Center Theatre Group, Crowded Fire Theater, East West Players, Marin Theatre Company, The Pasadena Playhouse, San Diego Repertory Theatre, and Skylight Theatre Company. There are no Oregon theatres listed with this special interest. The theatres profiled below are East West Players and the Oregon Shakespeare Festival.

East West Players was founded as a theatrical intervention in this double bind between hypervigilance against White xenophobia and internal concern for Asian and Asian American communities. In 1965, a group of Asian American actors founded East West Players out of frustration with the meager work they were getting to play nothing but stereotyped Asians in Hollywood (Shimakawa 58). They became the first Asian American theatre in the United States, and maintain a mission of “raising the visibility of the Asian American experience by presenting inventive world-class theatrical productions, developing artists of color, and providing impactful youth education programs” (“About”). Two recent productions of note are *Vietgone* and *Mamma Mia!*. *Vietgone*, which played during the 2018-2019 season at East West Players, is about two Vietnamese refugees taking a road trip from Arkansas to the Oceanside, California. Upon arriving, the male lead Quang observes that the Pacific “smells like home. It’s the Pacific. Same body of water that Vietnam’s in. Same ocean that touches our home” (Nguyen 64), This is both a paean to a homeland lost and a claim to a new homeland on the other side

of the Pacific Rim. A sense of foreignness – the Vietnamese characters are refugees and do not speak English well – permeates *Vietgone*, and this is the play that is in part set where it is produced. Playwright Qui Nguyen frames this linguistic barrier for anglophonic audiences by writing lines where the characters are supposed to be speaking Vietnamese in plain English while writing lines where the characters are supposed to be speaking English unintelligibly. For example,

Huong: Goddamn, English is a terrible language.

Bobby: Bacon cheeseburger McDonald's?

Tong: I'm not following.

Bobby: Bacon. Cheeseburger. McDonald's.

Tong: Am I...hungry?

Bobby: Nixon!

Tong: Oh yeah, I am hungry. Thank god for this amazing meal before us.

(Tong points to her terrible meal.) (55)

Nguyen manipulates English in his play to emphasize his protagonists' foreignness in a way that plays into stereotypes about greasy White Americans while still being intelligible to those audiences. While he addresses xenophobia differently than *La Comedia of Errors*, it still haunts his characters. *La Comedia* personifies the White threat to Mexican immigrants in the person of the Sheriff. Nguyen, on the other hand, telescopes the unease of foreignness out to a global inability to communicate. Whereas *La Comedia* gets real with Sheriff Solinus, Nguyen stylizes violent threat with humor – when the Redneck Biker attacks Quang, the fight scene is “the most badass martial arts fight ever to be seen on a theatrical stage” (Nguyen 62). When Quang is getting the better of him, the Redneck Biker calls for “Backup yeehaw!”, summoning ninjas, who Quang also handily defeats. The real anxiety for the characters is not from violent threats – they are South Vietnamese badasses – but from a general sense of alienation caused by language.

A sense of foreignness is addressed in East West Players' *Mamma Mia!*, although it is tempered through play selection and casting. The Producing Artistic Director's note for *Mamma Mia!*, which also played in the 2018-2019 season at East West Players, highlights foreignness. Mike Palma emphasizes that "[t]he narrative of being a foreigner in a country does not have to adhere to one with loneliness at its heart and that no matter where we go our customs and traditions go with us." Palma is referring to the owner of the restaurant/inn Donna Sheridan (Joan Almedilla). Donna is an American who lives and owns a business in Greece. Palma claims this ability to thrive and to be one's self in a foreign country as a site of joy. *Mamma Mia!* undercuts the alienation apparent in *Vietgone* by universalizing an immigrant experience. First, *Mamma Mia!* is not a play by an Asian or Asian American writer about specifically Asian or Asian American subject matter. Rather it is a jukebox musical based on the songs of Swedish pop band ABBA with a book by White English playwright Catherine Johnson. Second, while the Vietnamese and American characters are rigidly distinguished in *Vietgone* through language usage, the Greek and immigrant characters are not distinguished in *Mamma Mia!* outside of expository dialogue. This production emphasized the sameness of Greek and immigrant characters through an all-Asian American cast.

The Oregon Shakespeare Festival's production of Lauren Yee's *Cambodian Rock Band* takes a different approach to foreignness by effectively ignoring the existence of Cambodian Americans and packaging the atrocities of the Khmer Rouge for non-Cambodian audiences. In his director notes for *Cambodian Rock Band*, Chay Yew commends playwright Lauren Yee for giving "immediate voice to the voiceless, and visibility to the invisible living in this country." He does not directly address the question,

visible to whom? Surely members of “the Cambodian American community” are not invisible to each other, and they must speak to each other. There do, in fact, exist sizeable clusters of Cambodian Americans in the Gold Rush Zone, according to the 2010 census. 37,450 individuals identified themselves as Cambodian in Los Angeles County, and 12,557 identified themselves as such in San Joaquin County. Surrounding the Los Angeles hub are San Bernardino County with 3,904 individuals, Orange County with 7,072 individuals, Riverside County with 3,491 individuals and San Diego County with 5,963 individuals. Surrounding the San Joaquin hub are Stanislaus County with 3,934 individuals, Santa Clara County with 5,842 individuals, Alameda County with 5,246 individuals, Contra Costa County with 1,177 individuals, Sacramento County with 2,610 individuals, San Francisco County with 1,518 individuals, Sonoma County with 1,316 individuals and Fresno County with 5,618 individuals. Compare these two pockets in central west and southern California with the 18 individuals in Jackson County, Oregon, home of the Oregon Shakespeare Festival. These data, as well as those from the Racial Dot Map, suggest that the people to whom Cambodian Americans are invisible and voiceless are non-Cambodians – in particular, Whites. Yew indicates this when he observes that “We rarely see the Cambodian American community on our stages, less so on TV or in the movies.” The object of this visibility and vocalization, in OSF’s *Cambodian Rock Band* are non-Cambodian audiences in the homogenously White former gold fields of southern Oregon. Their image here is separated from their communities and put up for display in a heavily White community in Oregon. Within the story of the play, however, Cambodians are made foreign: those living in the United States maintain close ties with Cambodia, and the play takes place entirely there (whereas *Vietgone* takes place

in the United States and *Mamma Mia!* in Greece). The effect of this play is to both simultaneously ignore and patronize a domestic population of people of Cambodian descent while portraying them solely in Cambodia, emphasizing a perception of Cambodians as foreigners.

The text of the play also supports an impression of Cambodians as in Cambodia because that is where the play is set. Two of the main characters, Chum (Joe Ngo) and Neary (Brooke Ishibashi) do have connections to America. Neary is an American of Cambodian descent who is in Cambodia working on the prosecution of Duch (Daisuke Tsuji), the former head of a Khmer Rouge death camp (Yee 53). Chum, her father, is a survivor of the Khmer Rouge who took refuge in America. Neary's colleague and boyfriend Ted (Moses Villarama) is a Canadian of Thai descent. While *Vietgone* focuses on immigrant or refugee angst, and *Mamma Mia!* on immigrant joy, *Cambodian Rock Band* focuses on repatriation. However, the way the play is framed for an overwhelmingly non-Cambodian community as "giving voice to the voiceless" serves to set Cambodians – and Thais as well – firmly in place in Cambodia. Chay Yew, a venerable Asian American playwright, director, and artistic director, presumably knows who his audience is in Ashland. He also, presumably, is aware of Cambodian Americans. If these are taken as givens, then his program note might better be phrased as "giving voice to people you will never interact with." He is here struggling with – and feeding into – the White habitus described by Bonilla-Silva et al. that sequesters Whites by themselves except when they invite People of Color in briefly to demonstrate their own antiracism.

Golden Thread Productions is in a strange position as a MENA (Middle Eastern and North African American) theatre. The community that they represent is the broad swath of ethnic groups indigenous to North Africa and the Middle East (which includes the Caucasian parts of Europe). The Office of Management and Budget (OMB), to whose classifications the Census Bureau adheres, includes people of Middle Eastern or North African origin in their definition of “White” (“About Race”). OMB’s categories date from 1997, and in the 22 years between then and 2019, Americans have come to “view ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’ differently” (“Research to Improve Data on Race and Ethnicity”). This has been indicated by the burgeoning use of the “Some Other Race” category, “which was intended to be a small residual category” by people who identified as Hispanic, Afro-Caribbean, or Middle Eastern or North African. Calls for a MENA category in fact date to the public comment process for the 1997 OMB Standards. The 2010 Census Alternative Questionnaire Experiment (AQE) indicated “that a number of MENA participants did not see themselves in the current race and ethnicity response categories.” This has led the Census Bureau to recommend a separate category, a recommendation that OMB has yet to take.

However, one Golden Thread play is included in this section for a couple reasons. The first is that the play takes place in Palestine, which is in the Asian part of the Middle East. The second is that the MENA category does not directly correspond to an established community group during the Gold Rush. I want to be able to draw an analytical line from the Chinese community of the Gold Rush through Asian/Asian American communities today to set me up for the comparative analysis in the next chapter. Also, the play I saw does important work in emphasizing the importance of

nation-states in creating the domestic/foreign binary that can be particularly abjectifying for Asians and Asian Americans.

I saw Hannah Khalil's *Scenes from 71* Years*, at Golden Thread Productions in San Francisco on April 13, 2019. A series of short scenes offering glimpses at the then 71 years of Israeli occupation of Palestine, *Scenes* relies on projections (designed by Erin Gilley under direction from Michael Malek Najjar, the chair of the committee for this dissertation) for much of its spectacle. Highlights include footage of a military raid towards the top of the show and houses getting bulldozed. The focus on violations of the home does not seem to just be due to my own subjectivity as a viewer. One of the Jewish characters states that "You know when you belong somewhere", and the end of the show revolves around a speech by the eldest member of a Palestinian community to the effect of "We began to walk home. We are still walking." Khalil and Najjar use spectacle to establish a norm of the sanctity of home as a geographic location and to create an aberration out of violent transgressions of that territorial home. Using video footage evokes nonfiction storytelling by journalists to emphasize that this aberration is currently happening, and has been for the last 71 years. The homelessness of Palestinians and the territorial incursion by Israelis is abnormal, meaning that a situation in which Israelis did not steal land from Palestinians would be a civilized norm. This sense is reflected by Golden Thread in their posting a land acknowledgment in their lobby recognizing that their theatre is on Ohlone land. Khalil dodges a dichotomy between civilized Palestinians and savage Israelis by including the above-cited line about Israelis looking for and finding their own homeland. Homelessness defined in the context of Israeli occupation of Palestine (and American occupation of Ohlone lands) means statelessness. The normalcy

that *Scenes from 71* Years* advocates is one of nation-states, where “people who are citizens of a particular state should also, ideally, be members of the same national collectivity.” (May 7) In this way, *Scenes from 71* Years* promotes a view of justice critiqued by Menon, where the only way in which former subjects of imperialism can articulate their own liberation is by mimicking the imperial, statist forms imposed on them from outside. Menon is writing about Indian, Pakistani, and Bangladeshi indicating sovereignty through performances learned from their former oppressors, the British. *Scenes from 71* Years* does something similar with an emphasis on Israeli statehood. In this way, it looks forward to a kind of healing in which Palestinians are able to enact for themselves that the State of Israel does for its citizens. By extension, this same kind of healing is advocated for on behalf of the Ohlone in their relationship with the United States.

The line between *Scenes from 71* Years* and Gold Rush Asian theatres is indirect. Part of this indirectness is shared with *Cambodian Rock Band* – there is an expectation that people from outside the ethnic community about whom the theatre is focused will be the primary audience. While the early Chinese theatres sometimes had White audience members (who primarily came to gawk at cultural difference), that White presence seems to have been only incidental. At Golden Thread, as at OSF, that presence is planned for. Yew’s program note points to this, as does Golden Thread’s Mission Statement, which in part reads “Our programs expose non-Middle Eastern audiences to the authentic voices and alternative perspectives of the region, while serving Middle Eastern audiences who rarely encounter meaningful reflections of their own culture in the performing arts” (“About Golden Thread Productions”). This bifurcated audience focus was born out by

my visit to see *Scenes from 71* Years* where about half of the audience presented as Arab. According to Golden Thread's own audience statistics, they do primarily serve a non-Middle Eastern audience – 68% do not identify as Middle Eastern – and so they are right to maintain an intense focus on the external gaze and the ways in which outsiders perceive Middle Easterners. This is a far cry not just from the Gold Rush Asian theatres but also from East West Players' appropriation of *Mamma Mia!*, which was about claiming a joyful artwork from White society for a predominately Asian and Asian American audience.

Black

Social position

Looking at the Racial Dot Map, there are clusters of Black residents in Emeryville, Baldwin/Crenshaw in Los Angeles, and Inglewood. These clusters, at least those in southern California, are the product of White flight from urban cores to suburbs during the mid-20th century. In general, suburbanization was a product of elite White attempts “to insulate themselves from immigrants, the working class, and people of color.” (Pulido xxxix) During the 1940s through 1960s, subsidized housing to accommodate wartime industry promoted a general outmigration from the Los Angeles core. Whites migrated the furthest, out to the coast, and as far as the San Fernando Valley, Walnut and Anaheim. Blacks also migrated out, but did not make it so far – the principally arrived in Inglewood and Gardena. These migration patterns demonstrate an instance in which the conditions for White habitus happened on purpose by White people through conscious migration away from People of Color. Pulido also notes (9) that Whites took industry with them, leaving People of Color to fight over the scraps. This

marks a huge economic shift from the Gold Rush, where wealth was principally mineral or geographic (for instance, San Francisco's natural harbor), and hence tied to particular locations. The occupations that Blacks and Whites principally populate (management, sales, and office administration) are mobile and can be relocated to suit corporate objectives (United States Census Bureau, "Sex by Occupation for the Civilian Employed Population 16 Years and Over"). Even geographic access points are not so non-negotiable: the Port of Los Angeles is in part constructed through human agency. While the Gold Rush called for overt terrorism to restrict economic access to Whites, current alienation of economics from real geography allows for more passive strategies to hegemonize capital.

This analysis, however, obscures the emergence of a Black middle-class with access to economic and residential opportunity that would otherwise be reserved to Whites, indicated by both races sharing the same three top occupations. Lacy (2004) describes qualitative data from D.C. suburbs in which middle-class Black residents describe their strategies of selective or "strategic" assimilation within White economic, residential, and academic structures. Her interviews are about 20 years old, but her conclusions track with above observations on the productions of racial habitus. Her respondents describe a process of assimilation that provides access to sites of White capital while also maintaining, in some instances, inclusion within Black community (910). That sense of having feet in both worlds is in part due to racial discrimination (915). While the increased inclusion of Blacks into a White-dominated labor and management pool after the Civil Rights Act signals the diminishment of legal barriers to Black access like redlining, subtler forms of discrimination still exist as a way to

communicate to middle-class Blacks that their entrance into White spaces is transgressive. Sometimes these come as microaggressions, or deploying racial slurs that are not directed at anyone present (916). Sometimes the very act of inclusivity is a form of discrimination. Multiple respondents question the motives of Whites who allow them into their spaces: “is it because they want ‘em there, or is it because of the aid they get from the federal government?” (917). This relates to observations by McDonnell and Maira on how multiculturalism serves as social capital in leftist White communities. These subtle forms of boundary maintenance by Whites – in which Blacks are given to know that their access to economic, residential, and academic capital are ultimately due to the goodwill of Whites – strengthens the need for spaces in which Blacks can be free from the gaze of Whites.

On stage

TCG lists 11 theatres with a special interest in “African American” work in California for the 2018-2019 season. These are Berkeley Repertory Theatre, Center Theatre Group, Crowded Fire Theatre, Cygnet Theatre Company, East West Players, Marin Theatre Company, New Village Arts Theatre, The Pasadena Playhouse, The Robey Theatre Company, San Diego Repertory Theatre, and Skylight Theatre Company. While Oregon Shakespeare Festival is not listed in Oregon (only Portland Playhouse and Profile Theatre in Portland are), I profile OSF’s *How to Catch Creation* below based on ease of access during my candidacy based in Eugene.

The Oregon Shakespeare Festival’s production of Christina Anderson’s *How to Catch Creation* is an example of a failed attempt to create such a space within theatre. Garrett’s goal, as stated in her director note, was unattainable at OSF because of the

predominantly White audience. In her playbill notes for *How To Catch Creation*, director (and incoming OSF Artistic Director) Nataki Garrett writes that “[a]ll too often we are asked to witness the trauma of oppressed existence. Rarely are we asked to be seen as we exist when no one is looking.” *How To Catch Creation* is about a set of middle-class Black academics and artists negotiating love. In 2014, Tami (Christiana Clark) is figuring out an affair with Riley (Kimberly Monks), who is cheating on Stokes (William Thomas Hodgson) with Tami. In 1966 and 1967, G. K. Marche (Greta Oglesby) breaks up with Natalie (Safiya Fredericks) when she cheats on G. K. with her male coworker. The product of that infidelity, Griffin (Chris Butler) is best friends with Tami (in 2014) and is trying to adopt, a process made difficult by stereotypes about him as a Black man who has been in jail (he was wrongfully convicted, and is living off his settlement). In her “Windows into *How to Catch Creation*”, Dawn Monique Williams emphasizes Anderson’s choice not to include White characters. Referencing theory by bell hooks and Toni Morrison, Williams identifies the destructiveness of “the white gaze” in “the dramatic imagination.” Anderson removes that destructiveness to center Black characters in their own creation. *How To Catch Creation* was staged in the black box Thomas Theatre in the round – with seats on all four sides of the stage. When I saw it on 17 August 2019, I noted that the audience skewed White, or at least that the audience overwhelmingly had fairer complexions. While the White (or White-presenting) gaze may have been sidelined within the world of the play, it literally surrounded *How To Catch Creation*.

This replicates, somewhat, the dynamics in *Mother Road* and *Cambodian Rock Band* where a story about a racial or ethnic minority is being played out for a White

audience. However, while *Mother Road* seeks to locate Mexican Americans as Americans and *Cambodian Rock Band* enforces foreignness, *How to Catch Creation* seeks to center Blackness without considering that the periphery is White. *How to Catch Creation* was staged in the Thomas Theatre, which is a black box theatre with flexible seating. *Cambodian Rock Band* was also staged here with three-quarters seating, while *How to Catch Creation* was staged in the round, or with audience on all four sides. It is a contemplative play, considering ways in which bourgeoisie Blacks manifest gender in their personal relationships. All of the characters are connected to literature and education: Tami is a professor, Riley and Stokes are introduced reading together on a park bench, G. K. (Greta Oglesby) is a writer. Anderson even focuses on Griffin, who was wrongly imprisoned, as a prospective father who reads and lectures on Black feminism rather than as an ex-con. Two of the characters, Riley and Natalie (Safiya Fredericks), experience their sexuality blossom as bisexual. Tami and Griffin ultimately decide to have a child as what might be described as “queer platonic partners”. None of this is secretive or bad to show. It is simply by emphasizing the erasure of the White gaze at a theatre with an acknowledged White audience (Rauch et al.) that director Nataki Garrett misses the mark.

Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islanders

Social Position

This community is not represented on the Racial Dot Map, and account for a mere 0.4% of the total Gold Rush Zone population. According to the 2019 ACS (TableID B02001), counties at or above the mean Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander population (mean = 2,565) at or above that figure are clustered between San Francisco and

Sacramento, and in southern California inclusive of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino counties.

They also represent one of the two Census categories that correspond directly with the Indigenous Peoples of what are currently the United States of America. That recognition of being a special group with a prior claim to Pacific Islands held by the USA in general and Hawai'i in particular have come under attack recently from the White Right in Hawai'i and California. In the 2000 case *Rice v Cayetano*, the U. S. Supreme Court ignored "Hawaiian" as a term of Indigeneity, subsuming the argument of whether or not non-Natives should be allowed vote as trustees of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) into one of race. The Court ruled that the OHA, which administers Native entitlements in the State of Hawaii, should permit non-Natives like the White plaintiff Harold "Freddy" Rice to vote on the basis that a restriction violated the Fifteenth Amendment (Rohrer 107). Since the Fifteenth Amendment prohibits voting restrictions on the basis of race, the Court ruled that "Hawai'ian" constitutes a "race" which – in a liberal multicultural society – ought to be equal to other races. An antiracist critique of the Court's ruling might accuse it of historical amnesia with regards to the history of white supremacy in Hawai'i and how that history invalidates claims of "reverse racism." In fact, this is one of the critiques that Justice Stevens took in his dissenting opinion (Rohrer 113). More salient to the position of Native Hawaiians is the elision of Indigeneity in favor of race. If "Native Hawaiian" is a race like any other, then Native Hawaiians have the same right to the Islands as those other races. Indigeneity emphasizes their prior claim, as well as the dubious legality of annexation (Rohrer 148).

On stage

While East West Players claims to represent “Asian American and Pacific Islander” theatre and theatre artists, and Native Voices at the Autry includes Native Hawaiians amongst the Indigenous groups whose work they do, neither theatre produces plays by Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander artists. This absence is compounded by the dearth of Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders working in the arts or education to make them the least represented category here on stage. TCG has no “Special Interest” category specific to this demographic.

American Indians and Alaska Natives

Social position

According to the Racial Dot Map, the single greatest concentration of “Other Race/Native American/Multi-racial” is the Hoopa Valley Reservation. Scrolling north, one finds other lone brown dots (the color for this racial category) along the downriver stretch of the Klamath River, so corresponding with the Yurok Reservation. This concentration can be accounted for by the residential restrictions placed on the lower Trinity and lower Klamath by their reservation status, meaning that the Hoopa Valley and Yurok Tribes can restrict residence to their own members, and by the overall rural environment.

Both reservations are the outcomes of military zones established during the Gold Rush (Buckley 40). Because the early Klamath River and Hoopa Valley Reservations were controlled by the U.S. military – which had permission to use violence, even lethal violence, on Indians but not on Whites – they only served to keep Yuroks and Hupas out of White settlements, but not the other way around. The boundaries became more

permeable in the 1890s with the passage of the General Allotment or Dawes Act which parceled up reservations across the United States, making it possible for Whites to buy individual allotments from indigent Indians. Between 1891 and 1900, Yuroks lost about 51,000 acres or 87% of their reservation (41). Land loss within the Hoopa Valley Reservation came through federal action. In 1909, President Roosevelt enlarged the Trinity National Forest at the expense of the Hupa – any land left unallotted by 1936 would become part of the national forest. Action was taken immediately by the Forest Service, though, and over three quarters of the reservation went under the Forest Service's de facto jurisdiction. Even after President Taft revoked Roosevelt's executive order, the administration problem remained (Nelson 151). In 1911 the Hupas elected their first tribal council whose sole purview was to work with the Forest Service to jointly manage timber in the land that the Forest Service had taken over in 1909 (152). The Hupas organized a more robust tribal organization – the Hoopa Valley Indian Tribe – during the early 1930s and were recognized by the federal government in 1952, giving them power to restrict membership and limit residence on their reservation. Yuroks also organized a tribal organization – the Yurok Tribal Organization – but were unable to approve a constitution and therefore unable to be recognized by the federal government. They finally gained this important boon through a court case in 1973, and a subsequent Act of Congress in 1988. In *Jessie Short v United States*, the United States Court of Claims ruled that the Hoopa Valley Tribe did not represent the interest of Yuroks living either in the Hoopa Valley Reservation nor downriver. In 1988, Congress passed the Hupa-Yurok Settlement Act established a separate reservation downriver for the Yuroks,

giving them the same powers of sovereignty over maintaining tribal roles and limiting residence that the Hoopa Valley Tribe has on the lower Trinity River (Buckley 44).

While Indians are concentrated along the Klamath and Trinity Rivers, different, intertribal communities reside in metropolitan areas like the San Francisco Bay and southern California. Counties with above average populations of this demographic (mean = 5,416) are Contra Costa (5,863), Fresno (13,588), Humboldt (7,073), Kern (8,906), Los Angeles (81,491), Orange (12,961), Riverside (20,934), Sacramento (11,004), San Bernardino (17,061), San Diego (23,116), Santa Clara (8,607), Tulare (7,103), and Ventura (5,745). Data are not available for Trinity County. Thus, there are four centers: northern California around the tribal areas already described, the Bay Area (Sacramento, Contra Costa, and Santa Clara), and the Central Valley (Fresno, Tulare, and Kern) which runs into southern California (Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, and Riverside). Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura, and Riverside have the highest American Indian and Alaska Native populations (“Race”). This hub is in part due to the presence of the Sherman Institute, an Indian boarding school opened in 1902 and which continues to operate today (Rosenthal 8, Adams 57). A greater cause is the 20th century policy of termination and relocation, in which the federal government disavowed its state-to-state relationships with tribes, and thereby justifying reneging on their fiscal treaty obligations. They reallocated federal funding to job programs in urban centers as a way to move Indians off of their reservation lands and into cities. This policy, which lasted from 1948 into the 1970s, was a continuation of the assimilation policy of the late 19th century on which Indian child removal to boarding schools and the General Allotment Act of 1887 (Rosenthal 47).

On stage

TCG lists 5 theatres with a “Native American” special interest in California: Center Theatre Group, La Jolla Playhouse, Marin Theatre Company, Native Voices at the Autry, and Skylight Theatre Company. They list no theatres with this special interest in Oregon; however, I profile a production at OSF along with a production at Native Voices below⁶.

Native Voices at the Autry has a 21-year history in southern California and takes their role in the national Indian and Alaska Native community seriously, from play selection to making sure they interface with community leaders at new locations across the country where they develop work. In a talk with a graduate seminar at the University of Oregon on 15 March 2018, Artistic Director Randy Reinholz explained Native Voice’s play selection process. They begin with an open call, meaning that anyone who identifies as Indian or Alaska Native can submit a script. The scripts are reviewed by two in-house readers and one “highly regarded outside reader”. Their recommendations are passed on to Reinholz, who sends the scripts he is interested in to a “national council of academics, theater, and community people” with whom the staff at Native Voices engages in a “big long phone call”. Plays are selected on the basis of this phone call. In an email from 22 July 2015, Reinholz shared his strategies on building broad coalitions for Native theatre in locations where they have not worked before. He recommends that, when making initial contact, to “ask about their interests and needs as well as discussing Native arts programming”. The upshot that Native Voices’ community engagement is similar to that of Cornerstone and OSF (at that theatre’s most Cornerstone-ian in *La Commedia of*

⁶ The “Special Interests” included in OSF’s TCG profile for the 2018-2019 season are “Classical, Contemporary, Multicultural, Musical Theatre, and New Work”.

Errors). The emphasis on building a national, rather than state or regional, coalition emphasizes the actual paucity of Indians in general, let alone Indian theatre artists, in the United States. We are the only racial demographic in the GRZ which has had a campaign of biological extermination executed against us.

The Autry Museum is one of the nine performance venues in the GRZ which features architecture evocative of California's mission era. Their doing so references romantic notions of California's Spanish and Mexican history, touched upon in the previous chapter. During the Gold Rush, California's ranchero Mexican heritage was cast as an era of chivalry populated by free-spirited hidalgos and alluring "señoritas." As explained in the previous chapter, this narrative constructed a sense of Mexicanness in which Californios and Californias were historical and not part of the Anglo-Saxon, capitalist state incipient during the Gold Rush. During Los Angeles's rapid population growth during the early 20th century, non-Hispanic White Angelenos reinterpreted this heritage through a romantic lens that "rendered the city's Spanish and Mexican past as a touristic fantasy packaged for mass consumption" and "reflected a racial project that...targeted the city's racial and ethnic groups as candidates for either total assimilation or outright exclusion" (Avila 34). This 20th century assimilation of non-Anglo-Saxon culture was repackaging for sale to Anglo incomers. Erased from this picture is the slavery into which the Spanish missionaries pressed the Indigenous inhabitants (Gutfreund 168). Cultural institutions, like the Autry, that evoke California missions in their architecture follow the New Right during the Cold War when they framed the Spanish missionaries as the White originators of California as a way to claim it for Whites in the face of the burgeoning Civil Rights Movement.

Native Voices' 2019 production, *Pure Native*, played in March of that year. It is about a family and political crisis on a fictional Haudenosaunee reservation in upstate New York. On one hand it is a soapy love story about Karen Farmer (Tonantzin Carmelo), her husband Art Farmer (Joseph Valdez) and Brewster White (Kalani Queypo). They all grew up together, and Karen and Brewster were together until Brewster's drinking problem got bad enough that she had to leave him. He started drinking because he blamed himself for Art's father's death, and left the reservation when Karen left him. He moved to New York City and, at the beginning of the play, returns in a swanky suit. He is middle management for a company that is interested in starting a water bottling plant on the reservation. It would provide for personal career mobility for Brewster, but it would also – he pitches – provide economic development for a chronically economically depressed nation. The prospect of allowing a foreign corporation to use their natural resources for economic development proves divisive for the characters in the play. Ramirez uses her cast of five as a microcosm for the political, religious, and familial divides that exist in Haudenosaunee country. *Pure Native* was directed by Reinholz and dramaturged by Abigail Katz. Katz's "dramaturg note" is the first page in the program, and does not include a note by the director. Katz emphasizes that the audience will be both Native and non-Native, and that Native theatre can provide "a window into a world that may be unfamiliar to us" and then suggests that that spectatorship is a critical part of universal humanism. Her use of the word "window", however, suggests something more voyeuristic, like what *How To Catch Creation* does at OSF. The term for someone who looks at unfamiliar people through a window is a "peeping Tom". While universal humanism is all well and good, Katz's wording and

actual audience demographics in Ashland indicate something more exploitive. However, Los Angeles audiences are not Ashland audiences. When I saw the play on 22 March 2019, so closing weekend, most of the audience presented as Indian. The takeaway from this is that Native Voices has been very successful in building a community of not only Indian theatre-makers but also Indian theatregoers. This is the payoff of 25 years of conscious and sensitive engagement with a diverse and often factious demographic.

I saw *Between Two Knees* by the 1491s at the Oregon Shakespeare Festival on April 25 and September 20, 2019. It follows the Wolf family from the Wounded Knee Massacre of 1890 and the Wounded Knee Standoff of 1973 with a long detour through the Indian boarding schools. *Between Two Knees* is heavily reliant on spectacle. It begins with the whole cast, Natives and non-Natives alike parading on stage wearing chicken feather headdresses, brown leather-looking vests, loincloths and beating on hand drums. This transitions into a game show with the “Wheel of Indian Massacres”, which in turn transitions into the story proper. This begins with Ben German Whiteman (Shaun Taylor-Corbett), an Indian trying to assimilate, trying to sell a traditional Indian (Wotko Long) on circumcisions by showing him his upstage with their backs to the audience. The circumcision is literally radiant. The play takes a hard tonal shift when all the Indians, but Ben German Whiteman and his friend get shot on stage. Ben saves his friend from a Cavalry man by promising to do something even worse: he claims to be a scientist of Indian torture and is trying out a new method where one piles so many things onto the Indians that their descendants have psychological problems and don’t even know why. The Cavalry man responds, “That was fucking dark.” The play proceeds in a similar vein from there. Since space does permit an enumeration of every spectacle in this highly

spectacular show, I focus on just one here. It concerns the escape from the Indian boarding school by Young Irma (Shyla Lefner) and Young Isaiah (Derek Garza). To break free, they fight progressively more formidable villains like in a video game: first the “nunjas” (nuns who are ninjas), then the Mother Superior (James Ryen in drag) and finally the touchy priest (Rachel Crowl in drag). This is the culmination of the boarding school segment of the play, which is designed to show how those schools were structured around child abuse. *Between Two Knees* diverges from history by making an American boarding school Catholic. While the Catholic Church ran the Residential Schools in Canada, Indian Boarding Schools in the States were mostly non-denominational with a distinctly Protestant bent (see Adams 1995). What nuns (and nunjas) and priests give us are villains who are visually distinct from the protagonists. This distinctiveness serves to highlight the abnormality of child-removal policies in the United States. Further, pitting drag villains against protagonists who are played by actors of the characters’ gender serves to emphasize the deviancy established by the priest stroking Isaiah’s hair earlier in the play, but in a way that is cisnormative. Through their visual language and physical humor, the 1491s deploy anti-Catholicism and transphobia as a way to highlight the sexual abuse that happened in the Indian Boarding schools. Anti-Catholicism does not present elsewhere in the show (although New Age shamans are pilloried), but the drag villains here are compounded elsewhere with spectacles that normalize a certain gender-coded appropriateness for male bodies. Men are tall (like Ryen but not like Taylor-Corbett) and muscular (like Ryen and Garza but not like Justin Gauthier).

These two plays demonstrate an element of Native theatre in general: an emphasis on pan-Indianism. This focus on intertribal identity is an outcome not only of the

urbanization touched on above (Rosenthal 118) but also of Indian boarding schools (Adams 336). Pan-Indian identity, or adhering to a racial identity as “Indian” above racial identity is facilitated by institutions. The boarding schools were a network of residential facilities with classrooms and agricultural fixtures that housed and indoctrinated Indian children for the majority of the year. Rosenthal describes the American Indian Athletic Association (AIAA) during the 1960s in Los Angeles. The boarding schools and AIAA are a far cry from each other – one could choose whether and how much to participate in AIAA where one could not with the boarding schools. And yet, according to Adams and Rosenthal, they both facilitated pan-Indian organizing by creating environments wherein Indians from multiple tribes had the opportunity to interact with each other on neutral territory. Native theatre, at least in Los Angeles and Ashland, is not sponsored by any one tribe and does not take place on tribal land. It serves a socializing function similar to that of the AIAA where Indians from many different tribes can get together and do something that is fun for them. The difference between Native theatre and the sports sponsored by AIAA is that the makers of Native theatre assume that we will have primarily White audiences. AIAA, on the other hand, advertised in “the Indian Center, the BIA, the bars where the Indians hang out, and all the basketball games and all the churches” (Rosenthal 117). By performing for White people, Indian theatre artists place ourselves in a double-bind similar to that of the Asian, Asian American, and Middle Eastern/North African American artists profiled above.

Conclusion

This chapter has tracked current-day permutation of Gold Rush racial categories as they exist in and around regional theatre. The Progressive model of a linear continuum

between civilization and savagery has been replaced by an ideal of liberal multiculturalism in which races are all equal and – when treated equally – cease to have relevancy for social interactions. A good faith reading of liberal multiculturalism renders it intentionally antiracist. However, a deeper dive illuminates both the amnesia with which liberal multiculturalism treats White supremacy, and erasure it performs on Indigenous sovereignty. The first bad faith move within what purports to be an antiracist ideology serves to center Whiteness within cultural capital and hence within what it means to have “culture”. The second move serves to degrade Indigenous claims to the Gold Rush Zone. Taken together, liberal multiculturalism looks superficially like an antiracist position, but instead serves to appropriate Indian land for White people.

This chapter has not taken deep dives into either the layers that gender brings to the table nor to much of California’s status as unceded Indian land. Since no treaties were ratified by the Senate between the United States and California Indian groups, the only valid ceding of land was the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which is itself open to challenge because what gave Mexico a right to that land? If the answer is Spain, then, again, who told them it was theirs? Spanish claims to the Americas were based on Papal Bulls that presume that the Pope had a greater right to the lands of California than the people living there. In the vacuum left by at-best specious claims by the United States to the lands of the Gold Rush Zone, liberal multiculturalist antiracism steps in to fill the gap. Where Progressive racialization opined that Indians did not deserve the land because they were barely people anyway, liberal multiculturalism holds that Indians are just one of a panoply of races, none of which should be given special treatment over the other.

Everyone having equal right to the land denies Indigenous rights of refusal, which are key to sovereignty.

What this dissertation does aim to do is to trace the role of theatre as an auxiliary of state power as exercised through race and indigeneity in the Gold Rush Zone. The chapter previous looked at that role during the Gold Rush itself; this chapter has explored some of the ways that theatre contributes to social ideologies around race and indigeneity in the same region today. The next chapter will compare the two.

CHAPTER IV

QUALITATIVE COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

The previous two chapters introduced racialization within Gold Rush Zone theatre. Chapter II describes the Gold Rush as an event that initiated a new racial order. “Event” is here defined following Sewell: “Events may be defined as that relatively rare subclass of happenings that significantly transforms structures” (Chapter 3, section “Eventful Temporalities”). “Structures” indicates “the tendency of patterns of relations to be reproduced, even when actors engaging in relations are unaware of the patterns or do not desire their reproduction” (Chapter 4, introduction). The Gold Rush came sharply on the heels of American conquest (1848) and effected not only a massive influx of immigrants but also the establishment of the American polity and its incumbent racial order. Theatre largely reproduced those structures through a process called “suasion”, a feminized activist strategy that sought to instigate change through emotional evocation (Martin 138, Hughes 122). Chapter III offers a corresponding look at racial structures in theatre in the same location in 2019, at the height of the pre-pandemic Trump presidency. It also introduces notable changes such as the shift from a hierarchal to a triangular model of race (Glenn) and a shift in the cultural center of gravity from San Francisco to Los Angeles. Clearly, some things are different. This dissertation asks, what exactly is different about racial constructions in Gold Rush Zone theatre and what is the same? The preceding chapters lay out the data and the theories that this chapter will use to answer that question.

To do that, I utilize Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA). QCA seeks to identify the “relationships between causally relevant conditions and a clearly specified

outcome” (Wagemann & Schneider 3). The outcomes of interest in this chapters are four indicators of White supremacist and settler-colonial structures in theatre that have been introduced in the preceding chapters. They will be delineated in detail below. The conditions, or variables that may be causally relevant to the outcomes have been selected on the basis of those outcomes with an eye to the theoretical literature already extant with regards to the outcomes.

The cases are plays and events that have been introduced in the previous two chapters for which sufficient information exists to describe whether or not they exhibit each of the conditions and outcomes examined here. Plays and events that have been introduced but for which sufficient data does not exist have been excluded.

This analysis uses fuzzy set QCA. This means that each case is described as existing on a continuum from 1 (indicating full presence) to 0 (indicating full absence) with regards to each outcome and condition. The conditions and outcomes are listed in a “truth table”, a grid in which “each row groups together a subset of practices with identical combinations of set membership scores” (Devers et al. 17). The truth tables and the analyses which followed were conducted using an Excel add-in developed by Professor Lasse Cronqvist of the Universität Trier. Most of these subsets have identical scores for the outcomes as well – a few, however, initially did not. Those contradictions were marked with a “C”. Those contradictions are then resolved by revisiting relevant theory to revise ascribed conditions and by adding a condition to the model (Devers et al. 24). Once the contradictions were resolved, I proceeded to analyze separately for the presence and absence of each outcome and in light of the relevant theory (Devers et al. 3-4, Wagemann & Schneider 26).

Outcome Variables and Units of Analysis.

Since the research question here is to learn how much current-day pre-pandemic theatre reproduces settler colonial structures initiated during the Gold Rush, the outcome of interest is settler colonialism. This presents a problem because, unlike sea level rise (Liévanos 2020), homelessness (Marr 2012), or religious conversion (Smilde 2005), “settler colonialism” is a theoretical construct. While it is simple to say whether or not the sea level is rising, or whether or not a person is experiencing homelessness, or whether or not someone has changed religions, settler colonialism – as a form of racism – is experienced locally and so will pertain differently in different regions (Pulido xiv).

English-language Performance

One of the first outcomes for settler colonial theatre in the Gold Rush zone identified in the previous chapters is the predominance of the English language. During the Gold Rush, English was one of several languages in which theatre was performed: the others were German, French, Italian, Spanish, and Chinese. Of these, English, German, French, Spanish and Chinese correlated to ethnicities present in the Gold Rush Zone at the time with English language theatre was the most widespread. German, French and Italian were restricted to the Californian population center of San Francisco, where the largest and most cohesive German and French groups were found. Spanish-language theatre was more predominant in southern California towns like Los Angeles but did make in-roads as far north as San Francisco. Chinese theatre adhered to Chinatowns in cities like San Francisco and mining towns like Oroville. Today, English-language theatre still predominates: if anything, it is more widespread than it was during the Gold Rush. While Latinx theatres like the Latino Theatre Project in Los Angeles may slate

some Spanish-language plays, most of the non-English in professional theatre in today's Gold Rush zone is either in bilingual plays like *La Comedia of Errors* with a roughly even split between English and Spanish, or in snippets to give a foreign color to an otherwise English-language play like the Khmer songs in *Cambodian Rock Band*. Plays that are full in English are marked (1), those with less than half of the text in a language other than English with (0.75), bilingual plays with (0.5), and plays that are entirely in a language other than English with (0).

In the previous chapters, a corresponding condition for this is English as the *de facto* or *de jure* language of the state. From California's constitutional convention in 1849 through the 1855 legislative session, California's *de facto* and *de jure* institutional languages were English and Spanish. During the 1849-1855 period, Spanish was also an official language in California. During that 1855 legislative session, the Californian government ceased funding Spanish translations of laws, thereby sidelining Spanish and leaving English as the sole official language. Today, English is the sole official language in California. It does not have the same designation in Oregon, but as Chapter III shows Oregon still conducts its public business in English with minimal accommodations for speakers of Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese, Somali and Russian. California makes similar minimal accommodations for speakers of Spanish, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Khmer, Korean, Tagalog, Thai, and Vietnamese. Plays produced in the era with two civic languages in California are marked with a (0.5) and those produced after that era with a (1).

Nostalgic Performance

Early Anglo-Saxon Californian theatre also dealt in nostalgia for the lands from which they had immigrated in both Great Britain and the American East Coast. This looks both like production of plays written in Great Britain and the East Coast, and plays that take place in lands outside of California and southern Oregon. This nostalgia extended throughout linguistic groups that had their own theatres in the Gold Rush zone: Anglo-Saxon, German, French, Spanish and Chinese history were all represented. Indigenous Peoples and Blacks, however, did not have their history performed. Hence, historical representations of the ethnic or racial group performed fit on the civilization-savagery axis, where civilized peoples come from somewhere else *and* have a history. Some groups that were deemed more savage like Blacks and Pacific Islanders may come from somewhere else, but they were not considered to have a history. Even within the American Indian racial category, Noble Savages both came from somewhere else like the East Coast or Peru and were implicated in White history (although they were not deemed to have had history before conquest). The outcome nostalgic theatre, then, is indicated as a (0.5) if the play scripts were written outside the Gold Rush Zone or depict histories outside of it, (1) if it was written outside the Gold Rush Zone and depicts histories outside of it, and (0) if it was written in and about the Gold Rush Zone.

Building upon Hoelscher's theoretical basis for understanding performance of history in Natchez, Mississippi, these play texts celebrating the histories and lands of English, Irish, German, French, Spanish and Chinese people might be understood using Nora's concept of *lieux des memoire*. In Nora's analysis, France has suffered a rupture from memory, which is promulgated by oral tradition, through urbanization and the

disruption of peasant communities. This crisis of memory happens through migration, on however less of a global scale than during the California Gold Rush. The fragmenting of long-standing regional communities necessitates the replacement of “spontaneous memory” with deliberate acts like the creation of archives and the organization of celebrations (Nora 15). And, in the case here, theatre. However, not every immigrant group had its own theatre and Mexicans were not immigrants. Blacks and Pacific Islanders were not able to muster the population or economic or political resources in California or southern Oregon to support a theatre. White immigrants were violently eroding tribal land bases, so those communities had other problems than the creation of theatres even if such a thing made sense in the context of classic California Indian cultures. Mexicans, while a national minority in Gold Rush era California, performed *pastorelas* that dramatized episodes from the Bible and Spanish history. Immigration, then, is not a compelling condition for nostalgic theatre. Two other conditions taken as a pair may be. The first is that the community on which the play focuses has its roots outside of the Gold Rush Zone in that it is not a national minority. This is inclusive of all racial and ethnic communities besides local tribal and Chicana groups and is indicated by a (1). Only a play specifically about local tribal and Chicana groups are indicated by a (0). The second possible condition is that the community or communities depicted in the play are established within the Gold Rush zone. These communities are indicated by a (1). Communities that are not established, and so indicated by a (0), include those who are not present in large enough numbers to create identifiable communities (Blacks and Pacific Islanders during the Gold Rush, Pacific Islanders now) or those against whom the state is engaging in war (local tribal groups during the Gold Rush).

Chapters II and III have also addressed the role of historically relevant architecture in framing theatres within historical processes. This strategy began with neoclassic architecture in Gold Rush theatres like the Jenny Lind that evoked Roman imperialism. This seems relevant given contemporary Progressives describing American imperialism in terms of the Roman Empire. However, the architectural strategy of the Union Center for the Arts makes historically relevant architecture less compelling as an outcome indicative of structural White supremacy. Historically relevant architecture, meaning neoclassical, Mission or Elizabeth theatre buildings is better assessed as a condition that may adhere to nostalgia. Presence of one of these styles is indicated by a (1) and absence by a (0).

Upon my initial analysis, a contradiction arose with regards to *Vietgone*, *Mamma Mia!* and *Pure Native*. They contradicted in the nostalgic theatre outcome. *Vietgone* was assessed as being written in the Gold Rush Zone about Gold Rush Zone history on the basis of its South Coast Rep world premiere and the scene on the California coast. *Mamma Mia!* and *Pure Native* were not about Gold Rush Zone history. One difference between *Vietgone* and the other two plays which might have relevance to the nostalgic outcome is Nguyen's ethnologic research process, which he describes in the final scene of his play wherein the interview of Nguyen's father by the playwright is staged. The production of an archive to replace oral mnemonic strategies is important both to Nora (13) and Baudrillard (8-9). In addition to Nguyen, Lauren Yee used interviews to gather material for *Cambodian Rock Band* (Tran 25). Presence of an ethnographic playwrighting methodology is indicated by a (1) and absence by a (0).

Theatre as a Site of Political Organization

Chapter II describes how the Placerville Theatre and Empire Saloon in Placerville were used as a sites where political groups could meet and organize before taking action. This differs from activities like moral reform melodramas, anti-Mormon lectures and modern-day talkbacks in that while those may hope to *inspire* activism, the assemblies by the El Dorado County Democratic Party and the booster association that was promoting a property tax to fund the Sacramento-Carson road coming through Placerville merely used these spaces as jumping-off points before engaging in the political work that they wanted to do. Entertainment events that took place in these same venues are marked with a (1). All others are marked with a (0).

It was suggested in that chapter that Placerville's rurality could have been a contributing factor to that. The Placerville theatre would have been the only location in town with a large enough capacity to handle the crowds that parties and speakers were trying to attract. For current day locations, the census designates different locations as either "rural" or "urban". Unfortunately, it did not designate locations as such during the Gold Rush. That said, a writer for the Placerville *Mountain Democrat* evidences resentment for "our largest cities", demonstrating a conception of difference between residents of mining towns and cities like San Francisco, New York or Boston ("Theatrical" 8 November 1856). Rurality versus urbanity during the Gold Rush, then, will be ascribed based on local conceptions of their communities. Theatres in rural areas are marked with a (1), those in urban areas with a (0). Another factor that may effect whether or not a theatre building is used as a site of civic assembly is our current tax code that disallows 501(c)3 nonprofits, which all of the theatres considered in the current

period are, from political advocacy. Theatres and events that operate on a for-profit basis are indicated with a (1), those that are noncommercial with a (0).

Spectacle versus Simulation

Gold Rush theatre's moral aspirations were most identifiable in the use of spectacle in plays like *The Drunkard* and *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. As Hughes defines it, "[o]ur sense of the spectacular springs from the cultural norms that are jarred, destabilized, and exceeded in the process of representation" (14). Spectacle, in fact, reinforces those norms. Hughes focuses her analysis specifically on how bodies are made spectacular. Middleton's body becomes excessive and destabilizes corporeal norms through his experience of *delirium tremens* in *The Drunkard*. Stagecraft facilitates, but does not draw from, this focus. Eliza is the focus of the spectacle in *Uncle Tom's Cabin* of a maternal body in the extreme situation of crossing a river on an ice flow. The actors who played Eliza centered the audience's attention, but without scenic effects showing the frozen river, her predicament would not have born the same impact for the audience. For this kind of spectacle, which Hughes defines as "the body *in* spectacle", actors are demonstrating the body's vulnerability. A more radical kind of spectacle, "the body *as* spectacle", consists of freak shows like the one in which the Bornean man was displayed, where ideas about "how a human should look, act, and be...are promoted and reinforced at the expense of variety and difference." A third variety, "bodies *at* the spectacle" revolves around prurient audience fascination with spectacle. Colloquially put, the audience goes to the theatre for "thrills and chills" (15). She defines this condition, then, as stage spectacles in which the human body is displayed either to demonstrate its vulnerability, to establish audience norms at the expense of the performer, or to titillate

the audience. Spectacle and “enfreakment”⁷ are predicated on communal consensus about what is normal. As Hughes notes, during the nineteenth century “a variety of spaces emerged to control, contain, and hide abject bodies. These institutions coincided with new systems of bodily discipline, predicated on self-regulation, that were typically enacted through a repertory of acceptable behaviors” (16-17).

Foucault, who Hughes cites, describes a structure in which “[p]unishment had gradually ceased to be a spectacle.” (8) Instead of public executions and tortures, “criminal justice should simply punish” deviants by both removing them from the public eye and subjecting them to the threat of constant surveillance (73). While the panoptic prison is the prototype for this anti-spectacular, normalizing institutionalization, its technologies manifest in other arenas like factories (149) and the military (162). It also impacts the development of schooling in the nineteenth century (170). However, “[a]t the heart of all disciplinary systems functions a small penal mechanism” (177). While other institutions like industry, militaries and schools use panoptic carceral techniques to control and normalize their subjects, for the purpose of this project we will begin with looking for the presence of carceral system that monopolizes criminal punishment that serve the same population as the play in section. That presence is marked with a (1), and its absence – as indicated by vigilance committees or private security – is marked with a (0).

Hughes also references postmodern theorists as helpful but insufficient for considering 19th century theatre (8). The specific texts she references are Jean Baudrillard’s *Simulacra and Simulation* and Guy Debord’s *The Society of the Spectacle*.

⁷ Hughes borrows this term from David Hevey, who uses it as a visceral signifier of how photography creates Others out of disabled subjects.

She understands these texts as useful for her historical analysis, but as more aligned with more current-day theatre and performance. Since this dissertation is in part about current-day theatre, they may be more useful here than they are for her.

Debord defines “spectacle” as “a social relation between people that is mediated by images” (24). Spectacle is an “affirmation” of relations that already exist, meaning it reifies current human relationships and demands passive consumption on the part of the audience (26). Debord takes a Marxist approach to social relations in which workers are in the process of revolting against the already successful bourgeois revolution, meaning that spectacle is counterrevolutionary. However, as Almaguer has shown, California history is not entirely legible through a Marxist lens without prioritizing race relations. Applying Debord’s Situationist critique to settler-colonialism describes a situation in which spectacle affirms White hegemony over Native lands. Some of the ways that this happens have already been described by the other outcomes of interest: English-language theatre, nostalgic theatre, and theatre as a site of civic assembly. The territorial aspect of conquest in Debord is based on the “unifying” effect of capital, where the boundaries between societies break down in the interest of globalism (109). Students of Orientalism (Said; Maira) and of internationalism (Hollidge and Tompkins) have repeatedly observed the commodification of cultures from the peripheries of capitalism like the 18th and 19th Century Middle East (Said), India (Maira,) and Indigenous communities (Hollidge and Tompkins) for consumption within centers of capitalism like Great Britain and France (Said), the United States (Maira; Hollidge and Tompkins) and Australia (Hollidge and Tompkins). The temporal aspect of these outcomes, nostalgia, represents “a humanization of time” (Debord 88). As Baudrillard later notes, humanism is only possible by

classifying animals as nonhuman (133). He also observes that a “parallel” logic defines racism. He misses the part where racism fits within the humanistic spectrum. As shown in this dissertation’s Chapter II, Indigenous and Black people were sometimes classified as “missing links” between humans and animals. Temporality also provides an escape from Debord’s hegemonizing spectacle: “The revolutionary project of a classless society, of an all-embracing historical life, implies the withering away of the social measurement of time in favor of a *federation of independent times* – a federation of playful individual forms of irreversible time that are simultaneously present.” (Debord 107, emphasis in original)

Baudrillard’s *Simulacra and Simulation* also provides an avenue away from spectacle. Baudrillard’s descriptions of simulation are a conscious departure from the passive and docile spectatorship in Debord (30). The major difference is that passivity allows the spectators critical distance from the spectacle. In a simulation, all participants are actors. The functional difference between spectacle and not-spectacle, then, is geography of participants. In order for a spectacle to exist, it requires a definite separation from its spectators who are simultaneously recipients of the spectacle’s power and allowed to be critical of it. This describes all of the cases above. In order to provide a counterpoint, two non-theatrical cases are added: the China War in Weaverville, described in Chapter II, and Disneyland, which is treated on by both Baudrillard and Avila. Since the China War was a real battle with real casualties, but instigated by White settlers in Weaverville for their own entertainment, it is closer to a simulation than a spectacle. This event had at least two languages predominant (English and Chinese), and took place before English was California’s sole official language. It was a reenactment of

ancestral Chinese rivalries played out to deadly effect by members of the rival groups with the addition of White instigators. It occurred outdoors near the confluence of Five Cent Creek with the Trinity River (Cox 145). The local legal authorities tried to prevent the violence, but local White interest was too strong, and they were unable to do so.

Baudrillard has only a passing interest in romanticized history in the individual attractions at Disneyland, like Pirates of the Caribbean and Frontierland. More important to him is that “what draws the crowds is...the social microcosm, the *religious*, miniaturized pleasure of real America, of its constraints and joys” (12, emphasis in original). Avila’s read of the park, while more authorial, is similar:

Disney’s infatuation with the virtuous spaces of small-town American revealed the spatial dimensions of his imagination. His preoccupation with the settings that nurtured traditional folk values reflected a deeper conviction that human values and behavior were conditioned by their surroundings, and that proper surroundings cultivated proper values and behavior. That conviction not only dictated the placement of Disneyland in Orange County, but also guided the ordering of the space inside the park and determined the park’s thematic emphasis on small-town America, the ‘wild’ frontier, and the suburban family home. (106)

Disneyland opened in Anaheim in 1955, so well after Spanish was phased out as an official language in California. However, it does not cater to a specifically English-speaking clientele: it provides guest serves in Italian, French, Chinese, Korean, Spanish, German, Japanese and Portuguese as well (“Guest Relations”). Among its many “lands”, Frontierland stands out with regards to its focus on nostalgic americana. Although it includes Mississippian rides like the Mark Twain Riverboat, other features like the Frontierland Shootin’ Exposition and the Pioneer Mercantile giftshop are decidedly Western. The Big Thunder Mountain Railroad in particular features a “Disneyfied” account of California history as it takes riders through abandoned mines (“Frontierland”). This memorializing, however, focuses exclusively on settler not tribal histories in

California in particular and the Old West in general. A commercial enterprise whose only ostensible social goal is to promote the kinds of White suburban values touched upon by Avila above, crowds within the park are kept moving from attraction to attraction. There is no space here for civic assembly: a visit to Disneyland means a literal buy-in to the kind of social values promoted by Disney (the corporation and its founder).

The distinction between spectacle and simulation is not as sharp as Baudrillard makes it out to be in his rejection of Debord and the Situationists. It is better to think of them as existing in a continuum. On one end are proscenium theatres like the Angus Bowmer Theater at the Oregon Shakespeare Festival and Golden Thread in San Francisco which draw a hard line between performers and spectators. This style, initiated in the 1870s in Germany by Richard Wagner, in whose “auditorium the eye was to be directed away from the surrounding bodies [of the audience] and focused on the stage picture through a perceptual projection ‘such as the technical apparatus for projecting the picture.’ This throwing forward of the gaze would be achieved through a steeply raked amphitheater format that inclines the audience toward the stage and does away with side boxes, which typically afforded views of the musicians and other spectators in the house” (Hannah 56). This effect is what Taylor describes as “lateral invisibility”, citing Foucault’s description of the panoptic prison. On the other end are immersive events like Disneyland, the China War and – yes – Boal’s Theatre of the Oppressed where there is no clear division between audience and performer. In between those poles are intermediary arrangements of audience, performers and audience-performers including 3/4s seating arrangements (as seen in *Between Two Knees* and *Cambodian Rock Band*) and theatre in the round (as seen in *How to Catch Creation*). These intermediaries thrive in black box

theatres with their versatile seating arrangements. In some plays, like *Between Two Knees* and *Cambodian Rock Band*, the actors address the audience directly – they break the proverbial fourth wall – implicating the audience in the action on stage without fully involving them in it. Since spectacle and simulation seem to exist on a continuum where spectacle means a proscenium stage and simulation means an immersive environment, they will be indicated as follows: plays in proscenium theatres like the Angus Bowmer at OSF are marked as (1), plays in theatres without prosceniums but where the seating discourages the audience-members from looking at each other are marked as (0.75), plays with three-quarters seating are marked as (0.5), plays presented in the round are marked as (0.25), and immersive events like the China War and Disneyland are marked as (0).

All Outcomes

A fifth outcome describes the presence of all the other conditions (ALL).

The above outcomes and conditions are listed in Appendix A. The truth table for these data is included as Appendix B.

Pathways to and from English-Language Performance

Table 4 shows groups of cases as they relate to English-language performance (ENGL_PERF). Only solutions with 100% consistency are shown. The solutions are grouped in order of raw coverage. Capitalized conditions (e.g. ARCH) indicate their presence, lower-case conditions (e.g. estab) indicate their absence.

Table 4

Pathways to English-language Performance

Solutions	Raw coverage	Unique coverage	Consistency
ARCH*CARCERAL	0.58	**	1.00
Estab	0.04	**	1.00
engl_offic*carceral	0.04	**	1.00

The strongest pathway to performances in English is the presence of historically symbolic architecture with the presence of state-monopolized punishment and security. This describes the 1852 *The Drunkard*, the 1855 *The Drunkard*, the 1856 *The Drunkard*, the February 1856 *Pizarro*, the February-March 1854 *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, the May 1854 *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, the 1858 *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, the 1859 *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, the 1860 *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, *The Octoroon*, *Putnam*, *Vietgone*, *Mamma Mia!*, and *Pure Native*. These are all plays that are completely in English, were presented in theatres using neoclassical and Mission (in the case of *Pure Native* at Native Voices at the Autry) architecture, and were done in a location without an active vigilance committee or private security at the venue.

This is a surprising combination, since neither architecture nor incarceration presented initially as theoretically relevant to English-language supremacy. Even more surprising is that the absence of English as the sole official language, together with the presence of vigilance committees or private security, present a weak pathway to English-language theatre, meaning it has a relatively low raw coverage. However, both historically symbolic architecture and Foucault's references to language in *Discipline and Punish* point to an Anglo-Saxon center of gravity. Soulé et al., in describing the construction of the Metropolitan Theatre (which staged the 1855 and 1856 *The*

Drunkards, the February 1856 *Pizarro* and the June 1859 *Uncle Tom's Cabin*) using words that indicate religiosity – the Metropolitan was a “magnificent temple” with a “beautiful and chaste...interior” (481-2). The Jenny Lind was supposed to be evocative of theatres from the Atlantic states (353). These build upon Soulé et al.'s paean to the performing arts, where theatre was supposed to make “the sublime thoughts and moral teachings of great dramatic historians...palatable...for men of genius, talent, and education” (653-654). This in turn builds upon their initial statement of Anglo-Saxon cultural supremacy (53-54). With regards to neo-Mission architecture, Chapter III touched upon how that style reflected a White response to the Civil Rights Movement by constructing California as a White state founded by White missionaries. This highlights a way in which White Latin Americans and Hispanics are incorporated into (or, more cynically, mobilized by) an Anglo-Saxon cultural hegemony to suppress threats to itself.

It also highlights how White Latin Americans and Hispanics have always been junior partners in GRZ Whiteness: even during the early period of bilingual governance, Spanish was never on equal footing with English. Rather, the legislature provided funds to translate laws from English into Spanish. To use Hinton et al.'s imagery around translation, this presented Spanish as a “mere reflection” of English, rather than its own independent language (Hinton et al. 3). Because the law was primarily written in English, and the GRZ was and is a multilingual region, the division between English and other languages becomes discernable using Foucault's sense of language and law. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault writes about the production of a criminal class by non-members of that class. In other words, elites defined non-elites as criminal. One mark of that difference is that the now-criminal class lacked the language to understand the law. In

Foucault’s source, the definition is between “our prudish, contemptuous languages, overloaded with formality” and “crude, poor, irregular, but lively, frank, picturesque dialect of the market, the tavern and the fair...” (Foucault 276). Rossi, Foucault’s source, is writing about two different usages of French. In the GRZ case, the difference is more pronounced. In the GRZ the legal language is a form of English legible only to those who have trained professionally to speak and read it. This of course exclusionary to English-speakers without that training or else the funds to hire someone who does to speak on their behalf. It is even more exclusionary to those with no or limited English. The elitism here reflects the elitism that Soulé et al. describe in their excitement about theatre, where the target audience is “men of genius, talent, and education.” Their dramatic historians, like Shakespeare, also use English that can be impenetrable to English-speakers without specific training in that usage of language. The gravitational pull that surrounds English-language theatre in these pathways is one not just of linguistic nationalism, as in May’s theory, but one of linguistic elitism.

Table 5 shows the solution for non-English-language performance.

Table 5

Pathway to Non-English-language Performance

Solutions	Raw coverage	Unique coverage	Consistency
engl_offic*ESTAB*RURAL	0.33	**	1.00

The only pathway to non-English-language performances is the combination of an official language other than English, the performance focusing on a community that is established in the Gold Rush Zone, and a venue in a rural area. This describes the Chinese theatre in Oroville and the China War. Both were at least half in Chinese, took

place before Spanish was sidelined as one of California's official languages, featured an ethnic group who was already established in the Gold Rush Zone, and took place in rural communities.

Since “both the political and administrative structure of the state and its civil society are *ethnicized*” and part of that ethnicization is linguistic (May 326, emphasis in original), it follows that an ethnically plural state and civic society will accommodate a linguistically plural state and civic society. This requires established ethnic communities with their own languages. Rurality seems less important here for the same reason that urbanity seemed less important above. It may not be important that *all* languages established in a region have official status. Both of the cases with this combination of conditions and outcomes involve Chinese or Chinese and English – neither involve Spanish. This indicates that a language does not need to be “common” or “civic” in order to support non-English theatre. Spanish was well established as a civic language in southern California, Indigenous languages within tribal communities, and English was definitely ascendant as a result of American conquest. Chinese never had a state function in the Gold Rush zone; however, its presence was robust enough to support theatre both in urban areas like San Francisco and in rural mining towns like Oroville and Weaverville.

Pathways to and from Nostalgic Performance

Table 6 shows solutions for nostalgic performance (NOST_PERF).

Table 6

Pathways to Nostalgic Performance

Solutions	Raw coverage	Unique coverage	Consistency
GR*ROOTS*ESTAB*ARCH*rural*C OMMERCIAL* CARCERAL*ethno	0.55	**	1.00
gr*ENGL OFFIC*ROOTS*ESTAB*arch*rural* commercial*carceral*ETHNO	0.05	**	1.00
gr*ENGL OFFIC*ROOTS*ESTAB*arch*rural* commercial*CARCERAL*ethno	0.05	**	1.00
GR*engl offic*ROOTS*ESTAB*arch*rural* COMMERCIAL*carceral*ethno	0.03	**	1.00
GR*engl offic*ROOTS*ESTAB*arch*RURAL* commercial*carceral*ethno	0.03	**	1.00

The strongest pathway to nostalgic theatre is events that happened during the Gold Rush, focused on communities that had their roots outside the Gold Rush Zone but were established there, occurred in venues with historically symbolic architecture, happened in urban areas, were at for-profit theatres, happened during a moment in a location where security and punishment were monopolized by the state, and did not use an ethnographic playwrighting methodology. This describes the 1852 *The Drunkard*, the 1855 *The Drunkard*, the 1856 *The Drunkard*, the February 1856 *Pizarro*, the February-March 1854 *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, the May 1854 *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, the 1858 *Uncle*

Tom's Cabin, the 1859 *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, the 1860 *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, *The Octoroon*, and *Putnam*.

Every solution has the combination that the play concerns a group that has its roots outside the Gold Rush Zone but is established there. As such, they all experienced a rift with what Nora calls the *milieux de mémoire* or “real environments of memory” (Nora 7). Nora’s archetype for *milieux de mémoire* is the French peasant communities, “that quintessential repository of collective memory”. The collapse of these *milieux* is precipitated by “a movement toward democratization and mass culture on a global scale.” Memory exists, for Nora, in insulated cultures but disintegrates as these cultures interact with each other.

His analysis is based on Halbwachs’s *Collective Memory* (Nora & Kritzman ix-x). Nora analysis comes closest Halbwachs’s where Halbwachs asks us to “Suppose that a group splits up. Some of its member stay in the original place in the presence of the physical object, with which they retain contact. Others go away but carry with them an image of the object. The very place it occupies no longer remains the same, since everything around it is in the process of transformation. The object no longer has the same relation to the various aspects of its surrounding physical world” (204). With regards to the Gold Rush Zone, this dissertation has discussed Anglo-Saxon priorities in claiming space in several California communities. Those priorities were surveying the land, building permanent structures, and holding elections. The land surveying in which R. V. Warner engaged in what is currently Trinidad focused on establishing boundary lines with his neighbors (Wells 57). Surveying in Yreka also focused on demarcating property lots (198). In Fort Jones, the focus was on establishing a town border (213).

Halbwachs, citing Fustel de Coulanges roots this understanding of land tenure in ancient Rome:

Each field was surrounded, just like the house, by an enclosure. This was not a stone wall, but ‘a strip of land several feet wide which had to remain uncultivated, and which the plow was never supposed to touch. This space was sacred; Roman law declared it indefensible. It belonged to religion...On this line, at various distances, people placed heavy stones or tree stumps, which were called *termes* (boundary stones) ...the boundary stone fixed in the earth became, so to speak, the domestic religion rooted in the soil which announced that this soil was forever the property of the family...Once it was fixed according to the ritual, there was no power on earth that could displace it.” There was a time when the house and the land were so “incorporated in the family that it could neither lose them nor part with them.” (64)

England, France, Spain, and Germany all more or less had fallen under control of Rome and were influenced by Roman ideas of land tenure which were eventually transported to California. Setting boundary lines was part of an attempt to belong to the land in which English, Irish, French, White Latin Americans and Germans were newcomers. Land tenure took different characteristics between these different groups. The areas controlled Great Britain prior to the Gold Rush were marked by clearances of peasants from estates held by landlords to make room for livestock (Blessing 40). However, the English system of landlord/tenant was not totalizing. In Ireland, for instance, most of the 19th century rural population lived in *clachans*, villages that “housed a number of related families” (Blessing 112). Blessing describes them as “clusters” of houses that “were entirely lacking in any institution which did not originate in agricultural activity. They had no public houses (bars), churches or stores: meager economic activities were carried out at crossroads between settlements” (111-112). Blessing cites E. Estyn Evans in describing the “egalitarian” economic system that “could operate without the benefit of a landlord, but it was complicated by the subdivision among co-heirs and in former times by the

periodic reallocation of the holdings, which were scattered in many plots so that all shared land of varying quality” (112). As in ancient Rome, “access to land” was important “in the maintenance of kin groups” (114). The relationship between land and family was irritated in Gold Rush California and Oregon by the overwhelming preponderance of White men and the social stigma which they placed on marrying Mexican or Indian women. Feminizing locations like theatres were important in that they demonstrated space-making for women and, hence, for family.

Theatres were also one of the kinds of buildings for which neoclassical architecture was used. As opposed to ramshackle sheds or tents that housed ‘49ers and their stores, edifices like the Jenny Lind or Metropolitan made an attempt at permanence. It is in commercial, urban theatres like the Jenny Lind or Metropolitan that historically symbolic architecture is sufficient for nostalgic theatre. As Soulé et al. indicate, this was part of the project of making San Francisco a “rival” for cultural centers on the Atlantic Coast (353) and, in fact, for ancient Athens and Rome (653).

Finally, democratic institutions were a memory of immigrants’ places of origin, especially on the Atlantic coast. In his analysis of 19th century pioneer guidebooks, Brendan C. Lindsay observes that “The direct democracy emigrants employed as an organizing principle and as a way of legislating rules, conferring executive power, and adjudicating disputes among the company was an important tool that embodied the practical application of emigrant values.” Further, “[a]s...[Lansford] Hasting’s guide attests to, this notion of democracy was not only concerned with the journey at hand, but was also bound up with the goals of reconstituting the United States wherever emigrants might settle, satisfying an inevitable ‘march of civilization’ coming to be known as

Manifest Destiny” (71). What Lindsay points to, but Nora and Halbwachs do not, is a deliberately nostalgic project. American colonialism purposefully sought to recreate its cultural forms on the West Coast.

Table 7 shows pathways towards non-nostalgic performance (~nost_perf), or performances that premiered within the GRZ and whose stories took place within that region.

Table 7

Pathways towards Non-nostalgic Performance

Solutions	Raw coverage	Unique coverage	Consistency
engl_offic*RURAL	0.21	**	1.00
gr*COMMERCIAL	0.14	**	1.00
Roots	0.14	**	1.00
ARCH*ETHNO	0.14	**	1.00
CARCERAL*ETHNO	0.14	**	1.00
ARCH*carceral	0.14	**	1.00

The strongest pathway away from nostalgic performance is an official language besides English and a theatre in a rural location. This pathway describes the cases “The Ninth Wonder of the World”, the Chinese theatre in Oroville, and the China War. This group does not recommend non-nostalgic performance over nostalgic performance: “The Ninth Wonder of the World” relied on a purportedly Indigenous man performing in such a way as to validate White notions of Indigenous peoples as intermediary links between humans and non-human primates. The China War was an act of terror committed by White Weavervilleans amongst their Chinese neighbors. Even though these performances

occurred before Spanish was sidelined as an official language, they participated in the deprecation of People of Color that was instrumental in that sidelining (Heizer & Almquist 151). The White terror active in the China War was not restricted to rural areas, as the case of the Hounds shows (Soulé et al. 553-561). However, the China War was unique in that White participants played one group of Chinese off the other, rather than simply running a mob through Chinatown as occurred in Yreka (Wells 108). The Chinese theatre in Oroville (as well as Chinese theatres elsewhere) stands alone in this group as separate from ideologies of White supremacy in that it was theatre done by Chinese for a Chinese audience.

Vietgone at East West Players did similar work as a Vietnamese play done for an Asian American target audience, although it took a different, weaker pathway (CARCERAL*ETHNO) from the Chinese theatre in Oroville. Like Gold Rush Chinese theatre, *Vietgone* focuses on its main characters as immigrants or refugees (“Chinese Theatre”). The story of *Vietgone* begins with the main characters, Quang, Tong, Nhan and Huong, escaping from the Viet Cong during the fall of Saigon. The bulk of the play, however, centers on Tong and Huong in a refugee camp in Arkansas, and Quang and Nhan’s road trip from Fort Chaffee, Arkansas to the Pacific in Quang’s attempt to get home to his wife and kids. However, when Quang and Nhan reach the Pacific Ocean, playwright Nguyen shifts the focus from a terrestrial bifurcation between Vietnam and the United States to a unitary, marine point of view. The passage cited in the last chapter, that the Pacific “smells like home. It’s the Pacific. Same body of water that Vietnam’s in. Same ocean that touches our home,” recenters Quang’s source of home (Nguyen 64). By identifying himself with the Pacific Ocean, and thus the whole Pacific shoreline, Quang

indigenizes himself to the California coast. By using the Pacific as his geographic locus of identity, Quang picks up Americanness while retaining his Vietnamese-ness. As a Pacific person, he can be both Vietnamese and American. Quang's creation of a Vietnamese American identity lands as a radical departure from the vicious foreignizing that White Americans have done to other Asian groups (especially the Chinese Exclusion Act and the Japanese internment camps) as a way of creating a racially essentialized America in which Americans are White and nothing else.

Mother Road, which also takes a weaker pathway to non-nostalgia (roots), also uses this road-trip dramaturgy. This play is a sort of dramatic sequel to Steinbeck's *Grapes of Wrath*, and follows the relationship between the last White Joad, William (Mark Murphey), with his Chicano kinsman Martín Jodes (Tony Sancho) as they drive along the same Route 66 that Quang and Nhan took, only William and Martín head east from California to Oklahoma. Like *Vietgone*, *Mother Road* resists racial and ethnic binaries. Martín is both Chicano and White. This is one of the ways in which *Mother Road* resists the cultural and racial essentialism of nostalgic theatre. One of the features of American White supremacy is a denial of being multiracial. State and federal governments have often legalized this denial with the "one drop rule" for people who are Black and something else, blood quantum for people who are Indian and something else, and anti-miscegenation laws to deny intimacy between Whites and other races and reduce the number of people who are White and something else. Intimacy between people of different races is also highlighted in *Mother Road*, especially in the familial relationship between Jodes and Joad. The team they assemble on their quest from California to Oklahoma also includes Jodes's Chicana cousin Mo, his Black friend James, and

eventually Choctaw stranger Curtis. Playwright Solis is describing a picture of racial pluralism and harmony which is absent from essentialist anxieties about cultural and racial purity.

Both *Mother Road* and *Vietgone* work against the cultural and racial essentialism of the nostalgic plays and performances. These plays show culture and race as permeable and fluid. Fluidity, in and of itself, is not such a great departure from the Gold Rush racial order in which race and culture were viewed as a hierarchy along which a person could slide up from savagery to civilization or, more likely in their view, down from civilization to savagery. Where *Mother Road* and *Vietgone* depart from this hierarchical notion of race is by putting it on its side and making it horizontal. Both plays are about road trips: the stories and the development of their component relationships proceed the way the land lies. The land takes on added importance in *Mother Road*. The goal of the road trip is the Jode farm in Sallisaw, Oklahoma. Oklahoma, in the Great Plains, is part of a vast, flat part of the continent. Farming, working the land, is a way of life on both sides of Jodes's family: there's the Joad farm, but he grew up working "these fields when I was a kid. Me and Mom picked *tomates*, red *chiles*, cotton in the fall. It was the hardest work a body could do, but I didn't know it. I was with *campesinos*, doing it the *campesino* way. Hard dead-on-your-feet labor for shit pay, but there was somethin [sic] fundamental about this work. It mattered" (Solis 26). Farmers, *campesinos*, Jodes inherits a corporeal relationship with the flatlands of Oklahoma and Bakersfield from both lines of ancestors. God is also in the land. James, describing his call from God,

I was out of the pen just five weeks when I moved here and tried to live on what little my garden would give. But it gave less and less and after a while I was starving. I wanted so bad to stick up that gas station down aways, but instead in a crazy rage I went out to my garden and ripped what

greens I had right out of the ground. And there, where the roots were, I swear I saw it. Blood. Blood coming right up. I put my finger in it and tasted it and it was like honey but divine. I musta passed out right then 'cause the next day, I woke up in the dirt and there was no blood and I wasn't hungry no more. I replanted everything I tore out and it come up right with an awesome bounty. And I knew my call...I think she's done with us. This Earth. I think she's saying, this is what you get. You don't deserve the water so I'm taking it away, you don't deserve the wolf so your children won't never hear its howl again, and they'll never see the elephant and the clear skies over a blue lake full of fat trout and the rich loam of good land. I'm taking it all back, putting it out of your reach till you go, till it's safe for life again. At first I thought I could change her mind. But it's not her mind that needs changing. It's ours. (73-74)

God is in the earth, but so is death. That death, though, is put there by humans and just returned to us by the earth. Jodes's mother died of cancer caught from working in pesticide-sprayed crops. Towards the end of the play, the group disinters Grandpa Joad's bones to rebury them on the Joad land. The land is the reason for all the relationships in the play, and also taker and regurgitator of one of the truly universal human experiences: death.

The Pacific Ocean appears twice in *Vietgone*. Its second appearance is towards the end of the play when Quang confronts the impossibility of returning to Vietnam and uses the ocean to reformulate his identity. His centering the Pacific echoes something that this dissertation has already passed by, like the services sign on a freeway exit not taken. That something is a line of historiography that focuses on the Pacific and seeks to center it, as opposed to its antipodes in Britain, as part of a larger project of decolonization. This line of research provides the bulk of the secondary source material for the foregone analysis of Pacific Islander history in this dissertation. Rohrer, for instance, writes about the "rootedness and routedness" of Pacific Islanders who locate their roots in the routes they on the ocean surrounding their islands. The locus of identity is not so much on the islands but on the vast Pacific between and around them (42). This oceanic emphasis

counters the colonizing emphasis on land and on Pacific Islanders as landed people cut off from history until the advent of Europeans (40). The colonial racialization of Indigenous Peoples, as seen in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, insists on the mobility of colonizers and the stasis of colonized. Writing Pacific Islander studies so as to emphasize the islands as points of entrance and exit to the ocean, as well as navigable landmarks along the way (42), presents Indigenous People as fluid and eschews the culturally essentialist view of us as standing outside of time until Europeans “found” us. The first place the Pacific appears in *Vietgone* is at the beginning of the play when the American naval captain dumps Quang’s helicopter – his way back to land – into the ocean to make room for other helicopters full of other evacuees. Like the land in *Mother Road*, the ocean swallows and absorbs. Unlike the land, it does not return what is old and dead. Rather, it emits newness, change. It forces fluidity. This fluidity “allows” Quang “to complicate the nation-state, which encodes a rigid hierarchy of race, class, gender, religion, and ethnicity for its representative subjects.” (DeLoughrey 21) Those rigid indicators of identity, so important to Nora – and to a Vietnamese pilot who went to war for nationalism against the communists – are less easy to maintain once the sea intervenes.

Pathways to and from Theatre Used as Site of Democratic Organization

Table 8 shows the pathways towards theatre or other performance venues to double as sites of democratic organization (POLITICAL).

Table 8

Pathway to Theatre Used as Site of Political Organization

Solutions	Raw Coverage	Unique Coverage	Consistency
estab	0.33	**	1.00

Performances about groups who are not established in the GRZ is the sole pathway to theatre used as a site of political organization with 100% consistency. This describes “The Ninth Wonder of the World”. The other two plays that took place in a venue that doubled as a site of political organization, *Black-Eyed Susan*, and the November 1856 *Pizarro*, only have 80% consistency for this outcome. The primary difference between the three performances is that *Black-Eyed Susan* and *Pizarro* both focused on groups who were established in the GRZ (Whites, and Whites and Peruvians respectively), while “The Ninth Wonder of the World” focuses on a Bornean. A secondary difference is that *Black-Eyed Susan* and *Pizarro* were produced in Placerville after Spanish was sidelined as an official language, while “The Ninth Wonder of the World” was presented in an officially bilingual state. A tertiary difference, not reflected in the QCA, is that “The Ninth Wonder” was presented in the Empire Saloon, while the two plays were presented in the Placerville Theatre.

All three of these performances occurred in Placerville, which seems to be unique in that its theatre doubled as a site of political organization. The first indication of this double-use is on 27 January 1855 when the theatre hosted a meeting of Placerville boosters who were advocating that the Sacramento-Carson road be brought through their town (Harvey). This topic resumed in April of 1856 with a meeting by the boosters at the theatre to propose a property tax for the road in the hopes that the eventual rail line would

follow that route (Harvey & Wadsworth). The local Democratic Party held a meeting in the theatre in May of 1855 (Brumfield & Burwell), and also held meetings in a room above the Empire Saloon dubbed the “Democratic Club Room” between 8 July 1854 and 19 May 1855 (“Democratic Primary Meetings”, Burwell, “Enthusiastic Democratic Meeting”). On 7 March 1857, John Hyde, who had been an LDS missionary in Hawai’i, delivered an anti-Mormon lecture in the theatre (“Lecture on Mormonism, Brigham Young, Etc.”). Hyde toured the state that month speaking in other locations like Stockton’s City Hall, but not, so far as surviving records attest, in another theatre (“John Hyde Cut Off Root and Branch”). Other rural communities do not seem to have made similar use of theatres. In Yreka, for instance, the first set of Siskiyou County commissioners met in D. H. Lowry’s house (Wells 64) and later in the Verandah, “the most popular saloon in Yreka” (80). There are several possible reasons for this. First, many rural communities did not have a theatre during the 1850s. Placerville had their first theatre in 1850, while the town was still known as “Hangtown” (“HISTORY - Walking Tour of Old Placerville”). Weaverville, by comparison, did not have one until 1854. By 1855 it had two, but neither seems to have been put to much use until perhaps 1858 (Cox 129-130). The other reason is that in these mining camps theatres, or more usually saloons, had the largest capacity to accommodate large groups. Even San Francisco, as seen in Chapter II of this dissertation, bought a theatre to house its government.

Table 9 shows pathways away from theatre venues doubling as sites of political organization (~political).

Table 9

Pathways to Theatre not Used as a Site of Political Organization

Solutions	Raw Coverage	Unique Coverage	Consistency
rural	0.92	0.79	1.00
engl_offic*ESTAB	0.17	0.04	1.00

The strongest pathway away from theatre venues doubling as sites of political organization is that the venue is located in an urban area (~rural). The urbanity of theatre locations which did not double as civic centers most likely follows the same logic as the role of rurality in the Placerville Theatre and Empire Saloon's double use. Simply put, urban locations have enough buildings to house theatre and civic events in different spaces. Whether a venue operates as commercial or not has no bearing here.

The weaker pathway here is the combination of an official language besides English and a focal point of the performance on a racial or ethnic group that was or is established in the GRZ (engl_offic*ESTAB). This combination of conditions describes *Rent-Day*, the China War, Chinese theatre in Oroville, *The Drunkard* productions of 1852 and 1855, the *Uncle Tom's Cabin* productions of 1854 and *Putnam*. These are all Gold Rush era events from before Spanish was sidelined as a civic language, and focus on Whites and/or Chinese. The data set here does not include any German-, French- or Spanish-language plays. However, spaces which mounted non-English-language White plays like the Adelphi did not double as civic centers. Anglo-Saxons, Germans, French, Latin Americans, and Chinese all had specific theatrical traditions that they brought with them from the American Atlantic, Europe or China. California Indians, who were also established in the Gold Rush Zone, did not have specific theatrical traditions and the

bright boundaries between Whites and Indians and between Chinese and Indians precluded participation in White or Chinese theatre.

Spectacle versus Simulation

Table 10 shows the solutions for pathways to spectacle (SPECTACLE).

Table 10

Pathways to Spectacle

Solutions	Raw Coverage	Unique Coverage	Consistency
engl_offic*ESTAB*COMMERCIAL	0.20	**	1.00
gr*ARCH*CARCERAL	0.17	**	1.00
ARCH*commercial	0.17	**	1.00
Roots	0.06	**	1.00

The strongest pathway to spectacle is the combination of an official language besides English, a topical focus on a community established in the GRZ, and a commercial production model (engl_offic*ESTAB*COMMERCIAL). This describes the 1852 and 1855 *The Drunkards*, *Rent-Day*, the Chinese theatre in Oroville, the 1854 productions of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, and *Putnam*. Two other pathways are nearly as strong: current productions in historically symbolic architecture with a state that monopolizes security and punishment (gr*ARCH*CARCERAL), and venues with historically symbolic architecture and noncommercial production models (ARCH*commercial). Both combinations describe *Vietgone*, *Mamma Mia!* and *Pure Native*.

Both *The Drunkard* and *Uncle Tom's Cabin* are treated at length by Hughes, although she takes a national not a regional view of the ways in which these plays reified Anglo-Saxon normativity. Her analyses account for the established community condition and the commercial theatre condition in the above solution. Bilingual governance, or an attempt at it, was specifically Californian. With regards to *The Drunkard*, the spectacle of Edward Middleton's *delirium tremens* (or DT) is foreshadowed by Agnes Dowton, described in the cast list as "a maniac" (Smith 249). In her first appearance, in Act 1 Scene 3, she echoes Shakespeare's Ophelia with her lyric poetry about nature and death (264). Hughes reads in this that the play's draw was only nominally about witnessing DT, an affliction that in real life was locked away asylums. More broadly, the audience wanted to watch insanity (Hughes 47-48). The nominal focus on alcoholism, however, is racially significant: in the 1840s "public drunkenness or other alcohol-related crimes frequently identified them with African Americans or, through their surnames, the Irish" (Martin 35). The spectacle of Edward's drunkenness and – by extension – Agnes's rantings, draw them close to stage depictions of George and Eliza in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, whose blackface was often done lightly to make them as White as possible (Hughes 92). Edward, Agnes, George, and Eliza, then exist in a twilight between White and Black and, in the case of Edward and Agnes, between Anglo and Irish. As we saw in Chapter II, Irish were generally accepted as a type of English in early American California while Blacks were legally excluded. The thrill of seeing a racially identifiable character blur the boundaries between the audience's norm and what they perceived as racially strange seems to have been a major part of the draw to both of these plays in their East Coast productions.

As we saw in Chapter II, at least one of the three productions of *The Drunkard* – the 1855 production – was poorly attended (“Musical – Theatrical”). That performance was on a Wednesday, and the theatre (the Metropolitan) was subsequently shut until the following Sunday. *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* was better received, and its draw did seem to have to do with audience considerations of Blackness and their own potential proximity to it. For example, the 25 October 1854 production was done on a double bill with a “truly pictorial drama” called *White Slave of England; Or, the other side of Uncle Tom’s Cabin* (“Amusements”, 25 October 1854). *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*’s popularity seems to have been due in part to White audiences’ curiosity about what it might be like to be Black. Because *The Drunkard* was not performed in blackface, it could not fulfill this desire. The technology of a stage that separated the actors from the audience, as well as the knowledge that the actors were in fact Whites just pretending, perhaps acted as bulwarks for the racial separation that the Anglo-Saxon majority legally enacted during the 1855 California state legislature (Heizer & Almquist 150-151).

The kind of separation that Gold Rush stages created between actors and audiences was concentrated by Wagner with the development of the proscenium and raked seating. This type of staging is used by both East West Players and Native Voices at the Autry today. These two theatres also have in common their use of historically symbolic architecture (neoclassical and Mission respectively), outsource their security to the state carceral system, and are noncommercial. Hughes, in defining spectacle, relies heavily on Foucault (17). In describing the development of normalization in the 19th century, she cites Foucault’s analysis that

In a system of discipline, the child is more individualized than the adult, the patient more than the healthy man, the madman and the delinquent more than the normal and the non-delinquent. In each case, it is towards the first of these pairs that all the individualizing mechanisms are turned in our civilization; and when one wishes to individualize the healthy, normal and law-abiding adult, it is always by asking him how much of the child he has in him, what secret madness lies within him, what fundamental crime he has dreamt of committing. (193)

Foucault is dealing with three kinds of normalizing institutions: medical hospitals, insane asylums, and prisons. Specifically, he focuses away from the “ostentation” of a building’s appearance (172). This is relevant to the architecture condition, in that it dismisses it: the Union Center for the Arts is only neoclassical from the front, and the Autry Museum of the American West only has Mission-era flourishes on the outside. The more interesting architectural components of East West Players and Native Voices at the Autry are their proscenium stages.

For the purposes of the analysis of state monopoly of security, we will focus here on prisons. Foucault’s focus in the above quote is on the direction from “law-abiding adult” towards criminal. This is an individualizing direction. A normalizing direction, on the other hand, would run from the individualized criminal to the law-abiding adult. In this direction, the “fundamental crime” would not even be dreamt of. But telling someone not to dream of a “fundamental crime” is just the same as telling them not to think about a pink elephant. And it is impossible to prove that one has had a certain dream, or not had it. This is the cultural criticism that follows in Foucault’s analysis: “if from the early Middle Ages to the present day the ‘adventure’ is an account of individuality, the passage from the epic to the novel, from the noble deed to the secret singularity, from long exiles to the internal search for childhood, from combats to phantasies, it is also

inscribed in the formation of a disciplinary society.” The criminal, abnormal and individual, is no longer just the murderer or rapist whose crimes are published in the newspaper before they are hidden away within the prison. They is now anyone who has dreamt of murder or rape. These dreamed crimes are impossible to prove or disprove. And there is no sense here of a differentiation between a sustained fantasy and an intrusive thought. The criminal is now, potentially, everybody. This omnipresent potentiality of crime and criminals is the hallmark of terror: “Terrorists are effective precisely because they infiltrate security zones with all the performative accoutrements of ‘normal’ behaviour, circumventing the protocols of surveillance” (Bharucha 72). What Bharucha and Foucault each miss is the co-adaptivity of terrorism and surveillance. What Bharucha observes and Foucault misses is that surveillance can never catch every terrorist. Hence the “see something, say something” publicity campaigns of police departments.

Not only are one’s neighbors potential terrorists, but so is oneself. This is the upshot of the modernist literature referenced by Foucault, where crime and abnormality are internal. His critique is also applicable to theatre. Boal writes about the coercive power of tragedy where the “spectator” sees their own hamartia, or antisocial flaw, reflected in the behavior of the hero. When the hero is punished, usually through death, for their hamartia, the spectator is “terrified” into reforming their own equivalent hamartia (37). This catastrophe is not limited to the carnivorous eye-gouging of *Oedipus Rex*: Boal figures Dr. Stockman in Ibsen’s *An Enemy of the People* as a tragic hero whose catastrophe comes in the loss of social position for himself and his daughter (44-45). What Boal is writing

about, but does not name, is the much-touted use of empathy in theatre. Based on my own personal observations of conversations within our community, whenever theatre professionals feel compelled to defend our industry on Facebook or Twitter one of our go-to arguments is theatre's ability to teach empathy. Following the line of argument built upon Foucault, Bharucha, and Boal, this may not be something about which to brag.

If the empathy that audiences are taught in theatre with the cause of characters' catastrophes, then the resulting emotion is what Boal describes: terror at being found out and punished in kind. This relationship between empathy and terror motivates self-regulation. Diana Taylor, again citing Foucault, writes about the "lateral invisibility" promoted by the state terror in Argentina between 1976 and 1983.

Theatrical convention allows for splitting of mind and body, enabling the audience to respond either emotionally or intellectually to the action it sees on stage without responding physically. Terrorism in Argentina pushed this convention further, to atomize the victimized population and to preclude the possibility of solidarity and mobilization. No one dared to look to the side for fear that the person standing nearby was a terrorist or military infiltrator. This regimentation of the social and individual body was an example of what Foucault calls "lateral invisibility" ... (125)

Her citation comes from *Discipline and Punish* when Foucault is describing the mechanism of the Panopticon. Each cell is open to the central observation chamber, but partitioned from the other cells. This "lateral invisibility" is "a guarantee of order" (Foucault 200). If prisoners cannot see or even communicate with their "companions" then "there is no danger of a plot, an attempt at collective escape, the planning of new crimes for the future, bad reciprocal influences..." If this is reminiscent of the atomization described by DeBord and Avila with regards to automobiles and suburbs, it should be. In the car, especially on the interstate, high speeds and heavy metal ensure that

– for safety’s sake – the driver’s eyes are focused ahead and only move to the side to assess possible threats from other drivers. These same interstates are also heavily patrolled by police setting up speed traps. The suburbs literally partition individuals and families from each other. Even in the same house, inhabitants can be partitioned by private bedrooms. Taylor’s analysis is additive both in its application to blatant state terror as well as in its implication that theatre accustoms audiences to the same behaviors that assist in effective policing of communities.

Table 11 shows pathways to simulation (~spectacle).

Table 11

Pathways to Simulation

Solutions	Raw Coverage	Unique Coverage	Consistency
gr*COMMERCIAL	0.10	**	1.00
GR*commercial	0.10	**	1.00
estab	0.10	**	1.00
RURAL*commercial	0.10	**	1.00
RURAL*carceral	0.10	**	1.00
ARCH*carceral	0.10	**	1.00
engl_offic*commercial	0.05	**	1.00

The five of the six stronger pathways to simulation are all connected through similar conditions. This is perhaps in part due to the limited number of cases with a low score on the spectacle outcome. Disneyland is not a Gold Rush performance, and it is commercial (gr*COMMERCIAL), and it has historically symbolic architecture and its own private security (ARCH*carceral). The China War did happen during the Gold Rush

and was not done for profit (GR*commercial), it happened in a rural location and was noncommercial (RURAL*commercial), and it was rural and represented a breakdown in the sheriff's authority (RURAL*carceral). Both Disneyland and the China War have the lowest score on the spectacle outcome, and their point of connection is through the breakdown in the state's monopoly on security and punishment. "The Ninth Wonder of the World" has a somewhat higher score on this outcome, and its pathway to simulation is through its focus on a racial group that was not established in the Gold Rush Zone (estab). This pathway is just as strong (10% raw coverage) as the pathways listed above for Disneyland and the China War. A weaker pathway, an official language other than English and a noncommercial production model (engl_offic*commercial) only applies to the China War. However, because the lack of a state monopoly on security and punishment describes both Disneyland and the China War, and asserts such a pointed difference to the outcomes for spectacle, it emerges as the theoretically most interesting condition here. Its importance remains whether the case in question happened during the Gold Rush or not, and whether the production model was commercial or not.

Like Hughes and Taylor, Baudrillard also cites Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*. Rather than develop upon Foucault to show theatre and performances as modes of social control, Baudrillard shows social control through a rejection of Foucault. He does this by contrasting the technology of TV verité, or reality TV, with the Panopticon. The Panopticon functions on one-way surveillance, in TV verité "the distinction between the passive and the active is abolished" (29). He cites as proof of this *An American Family*, in which the cameras (and hence the viewers) watched the quotidian activities of the Loud family, "a typical ideal American family" with a "California home, three garages, five

children, assured social and professional status, decorative housewife, upper-middle-class standing” (28). The program culminates with the divorce of the Loud parents and the dissolution of this very suburban, very White “ideal” family, to which Baudrillard asks “was TV itself responsible? What would have happened *if TV hadn’t been there?*” (28, emphasis in original). He is noting the possibility that the Louds’ behavior changed because they knew they were being watched. This, however, is not different from the Panopticon: the prisoners manage their behavior under the assumption that they are being surveilled. The Loud’s “ideality” is what Foucault and Hughes call normalcy. Baudrillard posits that on account of their surveillance, they switched from normal behavior (measured by the standard of the suburbs) to abnormal behavior (by that same measure). The difference between *An American Family* and the Panopticon is that, in the Panopticon, the prisoners are never really sure whether the surveillance booth is occupied. The Louds, on the other hand, were very aware of the presence of the cameras. Their behavior, as indicated by Baudrillard’s question marks, may or may not have been solely a performance for those cameras. His conclusion is that the panoptic system has ended because “You no longer watch TV, it is TV that watches you (live)” (29). Because the Louds were supposed to be a normal American family, they were also supposed to be a family with whom audiences could relate or empathize. Because the audience might as well be the Louds, and vice versa, the distinction between audience and performer, “passive and active” collapses. Here Baudrillard switches from TV verité to genetics: “one must conceive of TV along the lines of DNA as an effect in which the opposing poles of determination vanish, according to a nuclear contraction, retraction, of the old polar schema that always maintained a minimal distance between cause and effect,

between subject and object” (31). This “implosion of meaning...*is where simulation begins*” (31, emphasis in original).

This is not the radical departure from Foucault that Baudrillard perhaps intends, but rather the logic of coercion discussed in the preceding section of this dissertation followed to its logical extreme. If everyone is a potential criminal (or terrorist as Bharucha and Taylor put it), then the police are potential criminals or terrorists too. In fact, Taylor is explicit in spelling out how the Argentinian police were unabashed with their use of terror. However, following Baudrillard’s logic, if the police are also terrorists then the reverse is also true: terrorists are also police. Put another way, however much a person deviates from the norm into criminality or terrorism – whether that is only in their private dreams or in public activity – that person still has a role in enforcing normalcy in others. Following the example of the state’s police, that enforcement can extend as far as publicly verifiable acts of terror. In justifying the first San Franciscan Vigilance Committee, Soulé et al. paint a picture of a legal apparatus encrusted in crime: “The old tribunals, and old delays – perjury – quibbles and technical errors – corrupt and bribed prosecutors – ignorance and corruption among the jury – misunderstood and misapplied laws – ay, life itself, and freedom again to run a long course of rapine and murder, all were suddenly opened, by this *legal* stroke of the executive, to the astonished and delighted criminals!” (584). Because there was no effective difference between the official legal apparatus and the criminals it purported to manage, the members of the Vigilance Committee and its supporters deemed the privatization of punishment a legitimate recourse.

An event at Disneyland in 2019 further illustrates the relationship between performance and the privatization of punishment. In June 2019, a fight broke out in Mickey's Toontown. A bystander recorded the altercation and posted it online (*Fight At Disneyland ToonTown 7/6/19*). The fight seems to center around Avery Robinson. At the beginning of the recording, he is standing over a stroller with a woman and another man in a yelling match with the woman. She spits on him, he strikes her, the other man intervenes. In over four minutes, the brawl spreads to involve several other park visitors. At the 53 second mark, the first park employee to arrive does so: an older sanitation worker who tepidly tries to intervene. He is cautiously staying out of swinging distance and seems in a bit over his head. At the 1:20 mark, a younger sanitation worker shows up and can be seen getting on his phone. At the 1:55, another park visitor attempts to intervene, presumably by telling Robinson that he was being recorded. Robinson responds that "I don't give a fuck about no video." At the 2:49 mark, he grabs a different woman from the beginning by the hair and drives her to the ground. A group of park visitors jump on him, pull him off, and pin him to the ground several yards away. It is at this point that the first park security guard on the scene can be seen standing in the background. The younger sanitation worker steps in close to the altercation but steps back once the group of visitors pull Robinson away. At the 3:18 mark a new security guard, this one dressed like a manager swoops in and manages to look busy while not actually contributing. Several other security guards descend shortly thereafter. One, in a yellow reflective shirt, takes a short tone of voice with a woman who had just been hauled to the pavement and who is panicking telling her to "Hey, do me a favor and calm down" before immediately walking away. A character actor can be seen in the background trying

to help the security guards keep a perimeter. Robinson gets up at the 3:57 mark and tells the men and woman who had been holding him down to “Keep your motherfucking hands off of my neck...” He approaches the woman he had just attacked and points his finger at her. She is still close to hyperventilating. Security is flocking over Toontown at this point, but no one takes any initiative to keep him from attacking her again. At the end of the video, he walks off shadowed by security guards.

Several instances in this video are relevant to the above analysis. One is the relative anemic approach of park employees compared to that park patrons who had paid to be there in solving the problem. The local police department is totally absent from this video, but presumably not later: Robinson was arrested (Bloom). None of the park employees seem to feel entitled to lay their hands on anyone. Maybe they are afraid about their own well-being. The older sanitation worker, especially, behaves cautiously. For him, the other sanitation worker, and the actor, quelling street brawls is hardly in their job description, and it is unclear whether they have health insurance (either through their employer or not) to cover injuries they might sustain trying to do so. Sanitation workers and actors have every reason not to get involved, and it is commendable that these three do. Park security, on the other hand, seems woefully unprepared to secure the park. Maybe they are only trained to deal with petty thieves and perverts, or maybe they are afraid that Disney will get sued and fire them if they lay their hands on a belligerent patron, but they let the job of quelling the altercation fall upon patrons. In effect, they are tacitly deputizing park patrons to enforce codes of normal conduct. As such, the patrons fill several roles: they are customers, they are police, they are audience, and they are performers. Their performance is only in part due to the camera. They are also active

participants in “the social microcosm, the *religious*, miniaturized pleasure of real America, of its constraints and joys.” (Baudrillard 12, emphasis in original) They are at Disneyland to participate in a simulation of “real America” which, in this case, involves paying to be the police.

Robinson proclaiming at the 1:55 mark that he does not “give a fuck about no video” is relevant to Baudrillard’s observation that “TV watches you”. Baudrillard wonders whether or not the camera altered the Louds’ behavior. Robinson is clear that it does not alter his. However, as he is announcing the number of fucks that he gives, he is walking away. Then he changes his mind. He turns around and adds that “I’m going to go to jail tonight!”. My read of this interaction is that prior to being told that he was on camera, he was not giving any thought to the consequences of his actions. Once he realizes that a verifiable record is being made, his first response is to leave to escape those consequences. When he turns around, he explicitly accepts those consequences. The video is evidence and directly relates to Robinson’s future, which now involves jail.

Finally, a reupload of the video from several months later begins with an opening title of the iconic fireworks over Sleeping Beauty’s Castle with the text “The Wonderful World of Disney”. The rest of the video is set to “When You Wish Upon a Star”, “Zip-a-Dee-Dee-Doo-Dah”, “A Whole New World”, “Be Our Guest”, “You’ve Got a Friend in Me”, “It’s a Small World After All”, “Can You Feel the Love Tonight”, and “Supercalifragilisticexpialidocious” (*Big Fight at Disney World!*). The uploader, Jeff Isola, is clearly making a statement. Disneyland, according to Avila, seeks “to instill a common, or dominant, set of values – particularly a respect for tradition and order – among a diverse and often unruly public” (106). Those traditions are epitomized by

“Main Street, USA,” which “extolled the virtues of small-town life, while Frontierland celebrated the national imperatives of expansion and the ideology of manifest destiny. The emphasis on ‘family entertainment’ at Disneyland asserted the necessity of the patriarchal nuclear family. And the prominence of racialized representations at Disneyland maintained a long-standing preoccupation with race and racial identity, while at the same time affirming a homogeneous vision of whiteness” (111). Isola, through his juxtaposition of the Toontown brawl with samples of Disney movies that are more readily accessible than a visit to Disneyland, is using irony to undermine Disney’s ability to promote the values that Avila outlines. The whole situation is “unruly”. Robinson is presented as the opposite of a benevolent patriarch, hitting a woman over a baby carriage. And Robinson and his targets are Black. The narrative of the original video, and especially of Isola’s reupload, is distinctly anti-Black.

The story of the original upload that is emphasized in Isola’s edit is that Blacks have no place in the simulation of America created by Disneyland. If, as Baudrillard argues, that “Disneyland exists to hide that it is the ‘real’ country, all of ‘real’ America that *is* Disneyland (a bit like prisons are there to hide that it is the social in its entirety, in its banal omnipresence, that is carceral)” (12, emphasis in the original), then Blacks have no place in the “real” America either. This argument is given more weight because it is unscripted. The Louds were unscripted, too, and their divorce was real. Like Disneyland, they simulated how the audiences were meant to see themselves. If the Louds’ “normal” marriage is subject to dissolution, then so is everybody else’s. The China War drew its rhetorical strength through the fact that the Chinese were the principal combatants. On that basis, newspapers throughout California could forget about the White instigation and

describe the Chinese as a violent threat. Whatever the backstory, and however one might try to justify their actions, they did have a pitched battle with each other in Weaverville. While spectacle gives the audience an out (it's just a play), simulation lets the particular stand in for the universal through its appeal to documentary truth.

All Outcomes

Table 12 shows the solution for the presence of all of the above outcomes (ALL).

Table 12

Pathway to All Outcomes

Solution	Raw Coverage	Unique Coverage	Consistency
engl_offic*rural	0.17	0.17	1.00

There is only one pathway to all of the outcomes with 100% consistency – the presence of an official language other than English and a production in an urban area (engl_offic*rural). This combination describes the 1852 and 1855 *The Drunkards*, *Rent-Day*, the 1854 *Uncle Tom's Cabins*, and *Putnam*.

All six of these productions occurred before Spanish was sidelined as an official language, and in San Francisco (*The Drunkards*, *Uncle Tom's Cabins*, and *Putnam*) and in Sacramento (*Rent-Day*). In the above section regarding the language of performance, I discussed how even during California's brief stint as bilingual state, Spanish was always the junior partner to English. California's limited bilingualism was a product of Anglo-Saxon delegates grudging concession to the eight Mexican delegates that denying suffrage to Spanish-speakers would violate the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (Heizer & Almquist 149). It should come as no surprise that a country as faithless with treaties as the United States would opt out of bilingualism as soon as it was politically expedient.

The section on spectacle shows that key difference between abnormality in *The Drunkard* and *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was that the latter concerned Black people. Edward Middleton was always performed as a White man, and of course had an Anglo-sounding name. George and Eliza were nominally Black, but Uncle Tom and Topsy definitely were. Anglo audiences were invited to see differences between themselves and protagonists in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, whereas *The Drunkard* invited identification. Audiences still seem to have desired identification with the heroes of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, as demonstrated by the lighter makeup for actors playing George and Eliza and the double bill with *White Slave of England*. Taken together, these conditions indicate a target audience who was increasingly defining itself based on skin-tone but who maintained an empathetic urge to identify with darker-skinned people who were not there. The limits to this urge towards identifiability seems to have been bound in by economic considerations: the sidelining of Spanish as an official language happened during the economic downturn of 1855 (Heizer & Almquist 150). As Almaguer demonstrates, Whiteness was the dominant point of economic organization in early American California. These economic considerations not only prompted the Foreign Miners Tax and the antivagrancy "Greaser Act", but also contributed the fiction of racial proximity apparent in abolitionist theatre without Black actors in a state that excluded Black immigrants.

Table 13 shows the solution for pathways to none of the other outcomes (~all).

Table 13

Pathway to None of the Outcomes (~all)

Solution	Raw Coverage	Unique Coverage	Consistency
engl_offic*RURAL	0.13	**	1.00

The sole pathway for none of the outcomes that indicate settler-colonialism in GRZ performance is an official language other than English and performances that occur in a rural area (engl_offic*RURAL). This combination describes the Chinese theatre in Oroville, “The Ninth Wonder of the World”, and the China War.

These two conditions have appeared together in combination with a community which is established in the GRZ (ESTAB) as the strongest pathway to non-English-language theatre. With regards to that outcome, the emphasis was on the importance that May demonstrates of having an official language besides that of the *Staatsvolk*. What he describes as “minority language rights” seems to have a watershed effect. If even one is elevated to the same level as the majority’s language, it seems to have a positive effect for other minority languages that are not so elevated. These two conditions also appear in combination by themselves as the strongest pathway to non-nostalgic performance. It is in that pathway that the tension of grouping the Chinese theatre in Oroville with “The Ninth Wonder of the World” and the China War comes into focus.

The presence of this outcome regarding “The Ninth Wonder of the World” and the China War calls into question English-language performance, nostalgic performance, a performance venue that doubles as a site of democratic organization, and spectacle as indicators of settler-colonialism in GRZ theatre and performance. “The Ninth Wonder of the World” relied on racist stereotypes of Indigenous peoples to entertain and educate White audiences and to provide seemingly one of the only avenues of work for a disabled person. The China War was an act of White terrorism within the Weaverville Chinese community. The distinguishing factor that was introduced in the nostalgic performance section was that the Oroville Chinese theatre performed for a Chinese audience, whereas

“The Ninth Wonder of the World” and the China War happened for White audiences.

This builds on the point above regarding the presence of all outcomes and a White center of gravity. I have used that term to describe not only the Anglo-Saxon majority’s tendency away from a bilingual state but also to describe the political motivations behind neoclassical and Mission architecture. In this discussion of the presence of all or none of the four outcomes described, it becomes clear that a central aspect of this “center of gravity” is the audience – namely is the performance targeting a White or non-White audience? A White target audience seems to lead not only to plays like *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, which are troubling but whose abolitionist tendencies at least come from a commendable place to horrors like the China War. A non-White target audience seems to lead to practices like Gold Rush Chinese theatre.

Conclusion

The outcomes of interest in this chapter are those that, based on the preceding two chapters, indicate White-supremacist and settler-colonial structures in Gold Rush Zone theatre. These outcomes are English-language performance, nostalgic performance, theatres used as sites of civic assembly, and spectacle. These outcomes may or not be transferable outside the Gold Rush Zone because, following Pulido, “racial divisions are experienced at the regional and local levels” so “it is primarily at the regional level that nuanced and meaningful comparison must take place” (Pulido xv). Within the GRZ, however, they are indicative of the ways in which theatre acts as an auxiliary of state power, whether or not the theatre creators so intend.

Most of the cases are primarily in English. This in combination with English being the *de facto* civic language of Oregon and *de jure* civic language of California

indicates that theatre participates in the normalization of the English language. Following May, who holds that every language is an ethnic language and that in making a language (like English) normal or banal we make the corresponding ethnicity (here Anglo-Saxons) the norm, we can conclude that English-language theatre corresponds tightly with Anglo-Saxon nativism in the Gold Rush Zone.

Foster indicates that “homesickness” was a motivator for the audiences that crossed the Bay in 1847 to see *The Golden Farmer* in Sonoma (Foster 39). The theories behind “homesickness” or nostalgia here are developed from those of Pierre Nora and Maurice Halbwachs who demonstrate the importance of creating concrete mnemonic devices, like theatre. “Nostalgic theatre” is defined in this chapter as plays that take place outside the GRZ. This is the only analysis that has indicated a necessary relationship between conditions and outcome: wherever nostalgic theatre as here defined occurs, it is about ethnic and racial groups that have their roots outside the Gold Rush Zone but are established within it.

Theatre as a site of civic assembly seems to be isolated to Placerville from 1855 through 1857. I have been able to identify no other instances of such double use of a building. In spite of its limited scope, it bears analysis because of the relationship between democracy and genocide identified in the Gold Rush Zone by Jack Norton and expounded on by Brendan Lindsay.

The role of spectacle in constructing a stable, homogenous society in 19th century theatre is derived from Amy Hughes’s analysis of moral reform melodramas. According to Hughes, the use of spectacle used grotesque deviations from the norm to motivate audiences towards corporeal standardization. Augusto Boal’s theories are geographically

tangential, but strike out in a similar direction: he claims that classic tragedy coerces audiences towards participation in their own oppression by literally killing off antisocial characters. Some of Hughes's theoretical sources are Baudrillard's *Simulacra and Simulation* and Debord's *Society of the Spectacle*, which have also become critical to my analysis. Debord's definition of spectacle applies not just to 19th century melodrama, but to all staged plays. The alternative that Baudrillard offers, simulation, describes immersive events like Disneyland and – as I argue – the China War in Weaverville in 1854. According to Hughes, spectacle upholds normalization that benefits Anglo-Saxons. According to Baudrillard and Avila, so does Disneyland. The China War was a simulation and also an instance of lethal, White supremacist terror. If the binary is between spectacle and simulation, then there is no preferable pole. Debord, however, offers a third alternative: no theatre, or art of any sort (7). His antidote to the oppression of spectacle is not a reform of art but rather a restructuring of society into “an antistate dictatorship” of workers councils (117). In the next chapter I will conclude by seeing what, if anything, might be salvageable from Gold Rush Zone theatre.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The research question that this dissertation has addressed is, to what degree does the racializing event of the California Gold Rush continue to impact Gold Rush Zone theatre and performance today? To answer that question, I engaged in a combination of eventful social-historiography with a regional focus and Qualitative Comparative Analysis. I began with perhaps the first explicit enunciation of how theatre corresponded with the formation of a settler-colonial racial hierarchy during the California Gold Rush, using an extended dating of that event from 1849 to 1860 in order to be able to address demographic changes indicated in the 1850 and 1860 censuses. For comparison's sake, I then proceeded to a similar analysis of theatre in the same region during the 2018-2019 theatre season. Much of that work has already been done before, albeit on a case-by-case basis that addressing the racially or ethnically specific theatre movements by People of Color (e.g. Karen Shimakawa for Asian American theatre, and Michael Malek Najjar for Arab American theatre). Scholarship of this type tends to take a national view, and so my research suggests further individual regional studies into Latinx and Chicanx, MENA, Asian and Asian American, Black, and Native theatre. This, however, was beyond the scope of this dissertation. In these two chapters, I identified four key pillars to the White settler state in California and southern Oregon, and how they are enacted within and bolstered by theatre. Those pillars are English-language performance, nostalgic performance, performance venues doubling as sites of democratic organization, and a continuum between spectacle and simulation. As shown above, a particular performance can exhibit all of those pillars, none of them, or one, or two, or three. The balance of this

dissertation proposes ways forward that address these four pillars in ways that, by dismantling White hegemony within and around theatre, work towards correcting the violence enacted during the Gold Rush.

Away from English-language Performance

Theatre during the Gold Rush was multilingual: while the majority of theatres produced their work in English, German-, French-, Spanish- and Chinese-language communities also produced theatre in their own languages. Today, almost all professional theatres in the GRZ produce work in English. Some, like the Latino Theatre Company, produce bilingual seasons: some of their work is in Spanish, some in English. Other theatres may produce the one-off bilingual English-Spanish play. The history of theatre in the Gold Rush Zone demonstrates a steady takeover of the English language from being the senior partner among several languages, to being nearly the only language in which plays are done. Society in the GRZ has not experienced the same push towards monolingualism: the American Community Survey lists more than 38 languages other than English spoken in California. There are over a million speakers of Spanish and Chinese each (*Language Spoken at Home by Ability to Speak English for the Population 5 Years and Over*). While California remains linguistically diverse, the past 188 years have seen the entrenchment of English as California's official language. When admitted as a state in 1848, California had two *de facto* official languages – English and Spanish. The California legislature sidelined Spanish in 1855 as part of a nativist reaction against Latin Americans and Chinese. The language of theatre in the region apparently follows the language of the state rather than the languages of society. Language in TCG member theatres in the GRZ, here used as a measurable group representative of regional

professional theatres, has followed that same trend: TCG's 2018-2019 Season Preview lists one play in a language monolingually in a language other than English.⁸

Based on the analysis in the last chapter, having at least one civic language other than English corresponds positively to theatre in minority languages, whether or not they are one of the civic languages. May's analysis, on which this dissertation relies heavily, advocates for "private use language maintenance" for all linguistic minorities, and full "language equality" for national minorities (196). Since "national minorities" are minority groups whose political presence in the nation-state precedes that of the current *Staatsvolk*, that means Chicanx in California and local tribes throughout the GRZ. May uses case studies to demonstrate language equality in three geographic locations: French in Quebec, Catalan in Catalonia, Welsh in Wales, and Māori in New Zealand. Māori is treated separately because it is an Indigenous language. Following May, then, we can use the examples of Quebec, Catalan, and Wales to sketch a path to language equality for Spanish in California, and the example of New Zealand for tribal languages in the GRZ.

Paths to equality for Spanish in California include Spanish-immersion education K-12 and equal rights for Spanish speakers in public-sector employment. Quebec, Catalonia, and Wales all have some form of immersion education in French, Catalan, and Welsh respectively. In Quebec, the 1877 "Charte de langue française entailed that all children in state education...attend Francophone schools – requiring, in effect, all Francophones, new minorities and other Canadians to be educated in French" (250). In Catalonia, the 1983 "Law of Linguistic Normalization...stated categorically: 'Education

⁸ *La Vispera* at 24th Street Theater Company was in Spanish.

centres are obliged to make Catalan the normal vehicle of expression.” In 1998, the Catalan Linguistic Policy Act had as one its objectives “to support the legal consolidation of Catalan language policies in schools and the wider civil service, the former by fully implementing the unified Catalan immersion education approach” (263). “Welsh-medium” education began privately in 1939 with a Welsh-language elementary school in Aberystwyth (282). Welsh-medium education was normalized by the 1988 Education Reform Act (283).

In California, simply implementing a Spanish-immersion curriculum is too far from where we currently are to be practical. The current state of Spanish in California curriculum is that it is one option for the “World Language Standards” (California State Board of Education). The next step towards Spanish-language equality in California education ought to be the creation of a curriculum category comparable to “English Language Development” but for Spanish – “Spanish Language Development.” Based on the experiences of Quebec, Catalonia, and Wales, this will meet considerable resistance from Anglo nativists who want to retain their right to monolingualism, so there needs to be significant political will not only to push it through, but to maintain it. In both Quebec and Catalonia, nationalist parties without separatist leanings have been the staunchest proponents of French and Catalan language equality. The current California legislature is staunchly bipartisan with a Democratic majority. The Democratic platform, under “Immigration” states that that party supports the ability of undocumented immigrants to learn English, but says nothing about their right to speak Spanish (California Democratic Party). The Republican platform simply states that “fluency in English must be the goal of California’s education programs” (California Republican Party). The will to build

towards Spanish-language equality does not seem likely to come from either of the two major national parties as they currently exist. This calls for the organization of a California-specific Chicana nationalist party to seek and gain election to state offices.

In Quebec, the *Charte de la langue française* stipulates that “all commercial signs were required to be solely in French” and that “all businesses with over fifty employees had to undertake ‘francization’ programs so as to ensure the right of any Quebecer to be able to work in French, in both the public and private sectors” (May 250). The Catalan Linguistic Policy Act, in addition to its educational policies, also strengthened “formal Catalan language requirements for civil servants working in the Generalitat and in local authorities” as well as increased “the presence of Catalan in the media and commerce fields...principally via the introduction of minimum Catalan language quota systems in the media, and the requirement of bilingual service provision in the commercial sector...” (263). In Wales, the 1993 Welsh Language Act assures adoption within the public sector within Wales (281). This is the most modest of the three non-Indigenous case studies in May, and so the most realistic for California with regards to Spanish. As cited in Chapter III, the extent of Spanish equality in the public sector is that the Secretary of State allows translations of ballots into Spanish. All of these moves towards language equality are legislative, and are most effective when a non-separatist nationalist party representing that language’s ethnic group is on hand to fight for and defend them.

Spanish-language rights in California have seen some gains in the past 30 years. For example, in 2016, a majority of California voters approved Proposition 58, which repealed 1998’s English-only education Proposition 227. Proposition 227 had received financial support from a number of California philanthropists, as well as Jacobs

Engineering Group and the Lincoln Club of Orange County (“California Proposition 227”). It was opposed by a number of unions like the SEIU and the California Faculty Association, as well as grassroots organizations like Education for All Children and Coalition for Children’s Education. It received its strongest support from the interior counties in the Siskiyou and Sierras that correspond with the greatest homogeneity of White people (Brown). A much broader coalition supported Spanish-language rights in 2016, including the California Democratic Party, unions like SEIU, 18 universities and school districts, and 57 other organizations (“California Proposition 58”). It’s primary opponent in 2016 was the California Republican Party. Support was concentrated in the more racially diverse coastal counties (Padilla). This shows that even without a dedicated political party like in Quebec and Catalonia, changes can be affected in California by broad coalition building along the coast.

Tribal languages in the GRZ correspond better with Māori than with French in Quebec, Catalan in Catalonia, and Welsh in Wales. The major difference is that while languages like Welsh were left to dwindle on their own by the occupying ethnic group, American, Canadian, Australian, and New Zealand Indigenous languages were the subject of government campaigns to eradicate them, often through child removal. May uses Māori as a success story in language revitalization. The language owes its revival, in a large part, to its presence in the educational sector. The first Māori/English bilingual school was built in 1977, prior to any legislative interventions in language decline (314). Those legal interventions began in 1985 and 1986 when the Waitangi Tribunal deemed that language was protected under the Treaty of Waitangi and that active steps needed to be taken by the national government to protect the language (313). The Waitangi

Tribunal is a “quasi-legal body” that was “[o]riginally set up in 1975, with limited powers to hear Māori grievances, it was invested in 1984 with the retrospective power to settle Māori claims against the Crown, dating back to 1840 when the Treaty was first signed” (307). As a result of that ruling, the Māori Language Act was passed in 1987. This included the right to demand that Māori be used in courts of law and established a Maori Language Commission. It was also during the 1980s that full immersion Māori-language preschool programs began. Initially they were run independently by parents (314). Both the Waitangi Tribunal and the full immersion schools were the product of grassroots activism (307). California is home to another grassroots language revitalization organization, the Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival (AICLS). AICLS came out of a 1992 language conference by the Native California Network (NCN) (Hinton et al. ix). It serves as a funding and training organization, with funding from three tribal governments and six grant-giving foundations (Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival). In 2002, it had “a close association with the California Council for the Humanities” (Hinton et al. ix), but that “association” is not currently mentioned on their website. It responded to a stated need by Leanne Hinton and Julian Lang for one-on-one language immersion by providing funding for immersive language training between a “master”, or native speaker of the language, and an “apprentice” who seeks to learn the language. They provide up to three years of financial support for 10 to 20 hours of study per week, as well as mentors to help with language teaching and acquisition skills. They are an intertribal organization, but the Karuk and Yurok tribes have also supported tribal-specific master-apprentice language programs (Hinton et al. 102). AICLS’s manual, *How to Keep Your Language Alive*, is a handbook

for master-apprentice learning, but provides avenues for other kind of language learning, especially in schools. They emphasize the need for apprentices to teach their language in their community, either by incorporating it into their classrooms or their home lives so that the next generation of children comes up hearing and understanding the language, or simply to follow Blackfeet language educator Darrell Kipp's advice to, "if you learned two words today...knock on your neighbor's door and say, 'Turn off the TV! Get the kids! I have two new words!'" (xvii). One of the ways that language can be taught, whether in the master-apprentice pair or in the classroom, is through play-acting. Hinton et al. recommend putting "yourselves in pretend situations and [trying] to use the language to act them out. Play with hand puppets and act out a traditional story. This sort of activity is easiest for those masters and apprentices who are involved in children's language programs...you can always justify these childlike activities by saying to yourselves, 'Well, we're really just doing this to prepare a lesson for the kids!'" (xvi). Theatre seems to be only tangential to tribal language revitalization and is only useful so far as it meets pedagogical goals.

Away from Nostalgic Performance

We have seen how nostalgia in theatre is a direct product of settlement from regions outside the GRZ. Some of the first Anglophonic audiences in California were residents of Yerba Buena (now San Francisco) who crossed the Bay to see *The Golden Farmer* presented by soldiers in Sonoma in order to assuage their homesickness (Foster 39). For those settlers, *The Golden Farmer* and later plays in the Gold Rush Zone acted as *lieux de mémoire*, to cite Nora, constructed mnemonic devices to recreate the *milieux de mémoire* they had left behind. Nora bases his theories on those of Halbwachs

concerning collective memory which employ an archeological method to illustrate the transplant of institutions from an imperial power to its colonies (for Halbwachs, this is from Rome to France). We have also seen how theatre was used as a “civilizing” institution meant to encourage moral uplift amongst a community of White men geographically closer to Mexican and Indian women than they were to White women. This notion of “civilization” is again an import from the American East with its vested economic interest in maintaining a clear line between Whites and non-Whites. Nostalgic theatre, then, is an icon of the ghastly twins White supremacy and settler-colonialism.

The practical route away from nostalgic theatre that was demonstrated in the last chapter is the production of plays about Chicanx and Indigenous groups from California, Oregon, and the Pacific. The preceding chapter also touched upon the looseness of the term “Indigenous”. In *Vietgone*, Quang finds a sense of geographic belonging through the Pacific, which connects Vietnam and California (Nguyen 64). The kind of Indigeneity he finds is the kind that has been enunciated by Indigenous Peoples in and scholars of the Pacific, meaning lands like Hawai’i and New Zealand that are surrounded by the Ocean, but who do not account for either Vietnam or California. In other words, Nguyen appropriates a theoretic framework of Pacific Indigeneity in order to indigenize his character in the homelands of the Kumeyaay and Luiseño tribes. This highlights the paradox of “Indigeneity”: it refers to both a global experience of subjugation to colonialism and a historical relationship with specific locations. This paradox presents an avenue for “pretendians”, as recently demonstrated by San Francisco-based Dancing Earth’s “Statement of Global Indigenous Identity and Solidarity”. On Indigenous People’s Day, 2020, Filipina Founder and Artistic Director Rulan Tangen addresses the

rumor that her claims to American Indian heritage were fabricated. She claims Indigeneity “through her own genetics and bloodline – by way of her lineage of peoples of the Pacific archipelago known as Philippines, which was occupied and colonized for hundreds of years by Spain and the U.S.” She doubles down on her claims to North American Indigeneity through “ceremonial adoption by Lakota and Anishnaabeg/Metis families who are Indigenous to Turtle Island and upholds those kinship responsibilities.” Her definition of Indigeneity, then, is two pronged: genetic kinship with communities who have experienced colonization and “ceremonial adoption.” Her “Statement” was met with disgust by North American Indian artists. This disgust is perhaps most rigorously described by Rhiana Yazzie, the Navajo Artistic Director of New Native Theatre in Minneapolis/St. Paul. Yazzie’s central criticism of Tangen is that her “Statement” amounts to a request for “permission to take Native grants and fellowships that were created to address the historical deficits American Indians face. Receiving a grant meant for a historically disenfranchised community has absolutely NOTHING to do with kinship” (emphasis in original). Yazzie also puts the blame on the White gaze, to which Rulan’s “Filipino features read more authentic as Native American than the average real Native American. Disney’s Pocahontas character’s face was based on a Vietnamese model after all. Being Filipino and dressing up as a Native American taking spaces meant for Native people has perpetuated a harmful and unrealistic stereotype of the American Indian that wants to live on in the American wet dream.” Yazzie’s response concludes by side-stepping Tangen’s adoption claim to drive home the point that Tangen’s use of Indigeneity is mercenary: “this letter [meaning Yazzie’s] doesn’t challenge pre-colonial perspectives on kinship, or that [Tangen] has made deep friendships within indigenous

communities, this letter challenges a person who monetized those relationships and lied about being Native American.”

The use of Indigeneity in *Vietgone* is similar to, if not as bald-faced, as that of Dancing Earth and Rulan Tengen. Nguyen makes no claims that he, himself, is Native American. In fact, he never even uses the word “Indigenous”. And yet, *Vietgone* presents a monetizable claim to California by an East Asian ethnic group just as do Dancing Earth’s performances. However, Nguyen’s motives do not seem to have the same cynicism as Tengen’s. The bent of *Vietgone* is not a mercenary claim of grant moneys dedicated to Native Americans, but rather an exploration of irreversible rifts with one’s homeland and the need to make a new home in America. While some of the techniques that Nguyen uses are reminiscent of those used by Dancing Earth, there cannot be meaningful links between the cognitive acrobatics of being a refugee and playing Indian.

Mother Road is the play used in the last chapter to illustrate theatre about national minorities in the Gold Rush Zone. This is one of the two avenues away from nostalgic theatre. It involves an exclusive commitment by GRZ theatres to producing plays about Chicana and tribal communities from their geographic areas. The exception to this commitment would be that, when the play do deal with immigrant groups (and, yes, that includes Whites), they follow the example of *Vietgone* and the Chinese theatre in Oroville and focus on that group’s relationship with the GRZ. While theatres should limit themselves to plays that concern their region, the GRZ is only one possible definition of the region described in this dissertation. *Vietgone* puts the GRZ as both the eastern edge of the Pacific region, and both *Vietgone* and *Mother Road* put it at the western edge of Route 66. Nguyen and Solis’s sense of region is not static, as it is in the academic studies

of “the Pacific” or “the Pacific Northwest” or “California” (or this study of the “GRZ”). Because race is experienced locally (Pulido xiv), Nguyen and Solis’s road-trip dramaturgy may be better than static approaches to region because they concern places people actually go and what they experience once they are there.

Theatres not Used as Sites of Political Organization

One of the major acts of the Gold Rush was the democratization of genocide. Jack Norton uses the Indian Island Massacre of 25-26 February 1860 as a case in point to show how that heinous act was perpetrated through democratic process. A week prior to the atrocities along the Humboldt Coast, it was common knowledge that a group of volunteers from Hydesville, California, were outfitted by a community fundraiser to hunt and kill Indians (Norton 47). He also notes how Indian slavery was enshrined in California’s first law as an American state (44). Brendan Lindsay develops Norton’s argument by showing how valorization of collective decision making and paranoia about Indians were imported to California by the same individuals. This dissertation has shown how theatrical productions in the Gold Rush Zone like *Putnam* ascribe democracy to American supremacy and despotism to British and Indian degeneracy.

Because of the tight relationship between democracy and White supremacy in California and southern Oregon, the double use of spaces as theatres and sites of political organization in Placerville, California stands out as an implication of theatre in genocidal worldviews beyond objectional scripts like *Putnam, the Iron Son of ’76*. Specifically, the Placerville Theatre both staged plays and housed assemblies by the local Democratic Party and booster meetings. The Empire Saloon served as both the Democratic

headquarters and presented “The Ninth Wonder of the World” – a freak-show centered on a purportedly Indigenous person.

The wave of Democratic and booster activism happened during a brief period between 1855 and 1857. These were the years of both an economic downturn that corresponded to nativist laws coming out of the California legislature and Bleeding Kansas. Both events resulted in a perceived vulnerability to both racial outsiders like Mexicans, Chinese, Blacks, and Indians, as well as racial insiders like Know Nothing and Republican Party members and Mormons. The local Democrats framed their paranoia with apocalyptic rhetoric, wherein their enemies were worse than the biblical child-sacrificing worshipers of Moloch. Their mentality confirms Landis’s read of the Democratic Party elsewhere in the country which acted as an engine of minority rule through mechanisms like the 3/5ths Clause, the Electoral College and the Lecompton Constitution in Kansas which was ratified by the proslavery minority. Landis also notes how American territorial expansion in the Mexican War (which yielded American conquest of California) was a landgrab for new slave states to bolster Southern supremacy and the Slave Power. While Landis clearly views proslavery politicians as villains both for their proslavery and their antidemocratic politics, what he demonstrates in the American East and that this dissertation has shown in the American West affirm Derrida’s more fundamental critique of democracy as an autoimmune political structure in that “it has wanted, on the one hand, to welcome only men, and on the condition that they be citizens, brothers, and compeers..., excluding all the others, in particular bad citizens, rogues, noncitizens, and all sorts of unlike and unrecognizable others, and on the other hand, at the same time or by turns, it has wanted to open itself up, to offer

hospitality, to all those excluded” (Derrida 63). This simultaneous process of homogenization and enfreakment as it concerns the GRZ looked like the production of a specific kind of Whiteness that included all light-skinned people as long as they could demonstrate public competency in Anglo-Saxon cultural norms, and the exclusion of those who – through their proximity – were perceived as a destabilizing threat to those norms. What Derrida terms “rogues” and Hughes the subjects of “enfreakment” were, in GRZ parlance, “savages”. Democratization was inextricably linked to Whiteness and White supremacy. While those values typically manifested in theatre through play selection or the valorization of theatre as a “civilizing” influence, theatrical spaces became sites of democratic process during the moment of heightened perceived vulnerability in Placerville between 1855 and 1857.

The case of Placerville, while anomalous, does serve as an indictment of theatre as part of a philosophical complex that allowed for atrocities to be committed in the GRZ. The relationship between theatrical buildings as sites of political assembly and the political crises of the 1850s deserves further study to better understand what went wrong and how not to repeat our forebearers mistakes. For now, suffice to say that – based on the QCA analysis in the preceding chapter – the same linguistic interventions outlined above ought to allay the double-use of buildings as theatres and sites of political organization.

Neither Spectacle nor Simulation

Both spectacle and simulation act as tools as settler-colonialism. Both have been used to normalize a particular brand of Whiteness – whether through moral reform melodramas like *The Drunkard* or *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* or through immersive events like

Disneyland. Simulation has also been used as a tool of White terror in the case of the China War. The previous chapter bolstered theoretical models that link the coercive power of both spectacle and simulation to the carceral state. California has had a prison system since its inception as a U.S. state, from a brig anchored in San Francisco Bay to San Quentin to 37 prisons and 44 fire camps today, accompanied by 14 prisons in Oregon. In California, Blacks are incarcerated above their proportion in the general population and Whites are incarcerated below their same proportion. This is indicative of the criminalization of Blacks, especially Black men, across the country that has its roots in the Nixon presidency and the Southern Strategy (DuVernay). This political realignment occurred during the Civil Rights Movement when Nixon and the Republican Party peeled Southern votes away from the Democrats, who had dominated the South since the bad old days of the Slave Power. The Republicans played on White fears of Black violence with the promise of law and order. We have seen how, in California, Indians occupied the bottom-most rung of the racial hierarchy established by Americans, with Blacks largely excluded. The reasons for exclusion were multiple, but one was the fear of disunion amongst California Whites catalyzed by Blacks. This relates to the bottom-most rung of the South's racial hierarchy being occupied by Blacks, the enslavement of whom allowed Southern Whites to disproportionately dominate Whites in the North, to the latter's resentment.

The prison as a sociological structure is related by Debord and Avila to the suburbs and by Hannah to proscenium theatres. These institutions are demographically separate from actual prisons in that they disproportionately serve Whites. The suburbs are part of a residential pattern in which Whites consciously separate themselves from

everyone else, but especially from Blacks. Some scholars, like Bonilla-Silva, call this separation “segregation”, evoking the forced separation of Blacks by Whites between Reconstruction and the Civil Rights Movement. Marcuse, on the other hand, distinguishes between imposed separation and voluntary separation. The latter is more descriptive of the suburbs, which are described in Marcuse’s taxonomy by “exclusionary enclaves” (249). His case-in-point is Beverly Hills, which is physically protected, upper class, discriminating and economically exploitive. North Ashland is another exclusionary enclave. Homogenously White, except for commodified multiculturalism on stage, it relies on lower-rent areas of the Medford Metropolitan Area to house its workers and serves primarily as a dwelling place for the wealthy and as a tourist trap. What Marcuse misses about these suburbs, but which Debord and Avila highlight, is that not only do these enclaves isolate their denizens from non-Whites and poor Whites, but they also isolate neighbor from neighbor producing what Foucault calls “lateral invisibility”. This invisibility is a carceral mechanism which, in a subjugated group like prisoners, is imposed by the state. Here, in a voluntary residential pattern, it is chosen by the group that lives this way. As was argued in the previous chapter, this is an outcome of the totalization of criminality and terror that is produced by, among other things, theatre’s weaponization of empathy.

Theatre contributes to the conditions in which the boundaries created by walls, rivers or exceptional commuting distances make sense through both its reliance on audience identification with abnormal characters and through proscenium seating. Stage characters are typically representations of human beings in a moment of crisis when they exceed both social and physical norms. This exceptionality, or “enfreakment”, according

to Hughes, serves to normalize the absence of these crises. The audience is meant to see their own potential for degeneracy in Middleton's alcoholism, and for racial otherness in George and Eliza's fair skin and Zoe's enslavement. If even you, the White audience member, has the potential for criminality and abnormality, then so could the person sitting next to you, or your neighbors, or the police who supposedly keep your neighborhood safe. This paranoia of one's neighbors through shame and self-doubt is assuaged somewhat not only through urban planning but also through theatre design. Proscenium theatres were conceived of by Richard Wagner specifically facilitate lateral invisibility by forcing the audience's gaze away from their fellow audience-members and towards the stage.

Spectacle and simulation exist on a continuum defined by the arrangement of audience in relationship to performers. Spectacle, in its most extreme form, is Wagnerian proscenium theatre. Simulation, in its most extreme form, is immersive make-believe either for fun like Disneyland or in deadly seriousness like the China War. On both poles of the continuum, however, the bolstering of settler-colonialism and White supremacy is constant. What, then are the alternatives? Debord's suggested "antistate dictatorship of workers councils" does not hold water once you remember Almaguer's argument that race constitutes a stronger organizing principle in the region than does class. Debord's workers councils would only reproduce the problems discussed here if they, like the early West Coast labor movement, are insularly White.

Even if organized labor is not as White supremacist and xenophobic as it was in the early 20th century – and PCUN offers a good example of how the labor movement can move and is moving away from that – it does not solve the issue of over-representation of

Whites and under-representation of everybody else as arts professionals. In part, the plethora of Whites in the arts and the dearth of anybody else has to do with Whites as the largest racial group. This majority has been constructed for nearly two centuries through exclusionary practices targeting Blacks, Asians and Latin Americans, and extermination practices targeting Indians. However, this does not account for the percentages of arts professionals who are “White alone” and “White alone, not Hispanic or Latino” being 19.8% and 20.4% higher, respectively, than their corresponding percentages in the general population. No other racial or ethnic category has this kind of surplus – in fact, almost all the others have a deficit in their representation as arts professionals compared to their representation in the general population. “Hispanic or Latino” is the only group that has a double-digit deficit – 18.5% lower in the arts than in the general population. Working towards 0%, “Some other race alone” has a 7.9% deficit, “Asian alone” 3.3%, “American Indian/Alaska Native alone” 0.1%, and “Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander alone” 0.0%. The low deficit for American Indians/Alaska Natives is in part due to the smallness of that population in California – caused, of course, by America’s genocide against us. Other reasons for these deficits and surpluses are not clear in the available data reviewed in this dissertation. Clearly, more research needs to be done to assess the pathways to and barriers from arts professionalization in a way that accounts for differential racialization.

Knocking Down All Four Pillars

I began this dissertation by reflecting on a paradox I experienced while working on *Off the Rails* at the Oregon Shakespeare Festival, where the same play could be both exploitive of and empowering to Indians. It seemed that the key was who was patronizing

the show: predominately White audiences could literally reenact Buffalo Bill's Wild West Shows, while Native audiences would feel excited about seeing themselves and perhaps being on stage. The final analysis in Chapter IV, where I tested to see which pathways might reliably lead to none of the above outcomes, seems to confirm this. A telling difference is between the Chinese theatre in Oroville and the China War in Weaverville. The first targeted a specifically non-White audience, while the other catered to the carnivorous interests of the local White community.

I also noted that some theatres are well-suited to draw audiences of color, while others are not. Theatres like Native Voices at the Autry, East West Players, and Golden Thread Productions, which have as part of their mission serving and representing a specific racial or ethnic group, and which are located in San Francisco or Los Angeles seem to have an easier time drawing audiences of color than the Oregon Shakespeare Festival. The Oregon Shakespeare Festival does not specify a target demographic and, since the *Staatsvolk* is marked by its banality, defaults into serving primarily White audiences. OSF is also located in a predominantly White metropolitan area. This works against initiatives to center, for instance, Black voices in *How to Catch Creation*. However, even a theatre like OSF can serve audiences of color by taking their plays to centers for those communities, as they did with *La Comedia of Errors*.

The invitation of *La Comedia of Errors* extended beyond performing it in Latinx community centers around southern Oregon. It was also a bilingual Spanish-English play, which told anglophonic audiences that – while they may understand the play – it was not just for them, and told hispanophonic audiences that it was for them. The same cannot be said for plays like *Mother Road* or *Off the Rails* which used non-English phrases in

mostly English-language plays. Although those phrases are better than nothing, languages are not collections of phrases and language-acquisition pedagogy like that of AICLS shows that languages are lost that way. While it was good that *La Comedia of Errors* was bilingual, and that *La Vispera* at 24th Street Theatre Company was entirely in Spanish, their relative isolation in the professional theater ecosystem shows that theatre in general is part of the problem and not part of the solution with regards to promoting minority language rights and dismantling the English monolingualism that has been enforced in the GRZ since at least 1855. While skills from theatre – like playacting and puppetry – can be and are used pedagogically to revitalize tribal languages, the appropriate spheres for this kind of work seem to be in tribal communities and in electoral politics.

My broader concern is that theatre is not only the wrong kind of institution to promote minority language rights and work away from English-monolingualism, but also the wrong kind of institution to dismantle White supremacy in general. The analysis of National Endowment for the Arts and American Community Survey data in Chapter III shows that theatre is a restricted medium. When taken together with research that suggests that people with high cultural capital, as measured by employment within the arts and education sectors, along with the expectations of audience demographics evidenced in Chay Yew's program note for *Cambodian Rock Band* and Abigail Katz's program note for *Pure Native*, it seems that theatre audiences across the board are predominantly White. Less restricted and more inclusive media include books in general and movies and TV, and the available data show that movies, in particular, are well adapted to serve audiences of color when they feature a large workforce of color.

That is not to discount the good work done by plays like *La Comedia of Errors* and *La Vispera* with regards to language rights, or *Mother Road* and *Vietgone* with regards to working against nostalgia. There seems especially to be merit to plays like *Mother Road* and *Vietgone* that develop upon notions of human geography as routed. This suggests that, if plays are to be produced, they ought to be about human migration through the location in which they are produced. In order for this to happen, regional definitions like the GRZ are less useful than naming a particular artery of human movement like Route 66 in *Mother Road* and *Vietgone*. This is something that theatre, as a fundamentally local undertaking, can do that media like books and movies cannot. However, media like fairs, festivals, art museums and galleries are also locked in to one geography like theatre. Since they are less restrictive than theatre, they may in fact be in a better position to do that anti-nostalgia work.

To return to *Off the Rails*, the area in which it succeeded was the Indian turnout on opening night. It should be noted that when I saw it a few months after opening, the audience was far Whiter. Theatre is ill-suited to address the linguistic pillar of White supremacy and settler colonialism in the GRZ, and so it is not on plays like *Off the Rails* to be entirely in (for instance) Pawnee. It did operate as a nostalgic play in its geographic focus on Genoa, Nebraska. A less nostalgic approach would have been to focus on a boarding school with connections to Los Angeles like Sherman for the Native Voices workshop production, and with connections to southern Oregon like Chemawa in Salem for the Oregon Shakespeare Festival production. This, of course, severely limits the transferability of plays. In professional theatre, part of a play's success is measured by its subsequent productions around the country. A non-nostalgic theatre would be laser

focused on its hometown and plays would only travel along the routes of human movement described in the scripts. A production model like that of *La Comedia of Errors* is well-suited to this. A non-nostalgic *Off the Rails* might be presented in the Angus Bowmer Theatre on the OSF campus, but it would also be presented at community centers of tribes connected to Chemawa, as well as at Chemawa itself.

Theatre is very limited in the kind of work it can do against White supremacy in the GRZ, and what it can do can be done better in other media. Theatre can stand to benefit from movements to teach Spanish in California schools and master-apprentice training for tribal languages, but has very little to offer besides an inclination towards pedagogy that includes participatory skits and puppet shows. Theatre's main strength is in telling non-nostalgic stories in plays about human movement through the places in which it is staged. But sourcing scripts through a national network of playwrights, new play development processes, and premieres, theatre largely ignores this potential that it has. The most damning thing about theatre, though, is in the overrepresentation of White labor and White audiences which seem to correlate to its restrictiveness as a medium. While it can do work to undercut White supremacy through non-nostalgic storytelling, less restrictive media like museums and fairs can do it better. Professional theatre continues to do the colonizing work that it did during the Gold Rush. If anything, its commitment to White supremacy has only increased in its commitment to the English language. Its commitment to nostalgia and White audiences seem to have remained relatively consistent. If the work it can do to dismantle White supremacy is limited and, in most cases, eschewed, then the question arises as to whether participation in it is ethically defensible.

Those ethics, like theatre itself, ought to be rooted in conditions within communities. The plays analyzed in 2018-2019 as this dissertation's "now" are already out of date at the time of publication. Analysis of plays in future seasons using the methodology used here ought to progress somewhat differently than I have done here. In selecting a region, one ought to lean more heavily into Pulido's notion of region and DeLoughrey's notion of routes. Rather than using the GRZ as the location of inquiry, a researcher ought to begin with an individual town like Ashland or Placerville, and then defining the geography of interest through average commuting distances. The research ought to then take a random, representative sample of plays produced during one or two years during which conditions of statehood and Whiteness shifted in that geography. For Californian geographies, those might be 1849 and 1855. The end of the analysis of those plays ought to be most of the outcomes and conditions to be used in the QCA. Before the theatre season of the researcher's present commences, the researcher ought to take a random, representative sample of theatre productions *and other cultural events which may demonstrate all of the outcomes of interest* to witness first-hand. At the end of the season, the researcher would perform the QCA and make recommendations to the arts producers for two seasons from now. Because of the seasonality of theatre production, plays and initiatives need to be already in process for the next season by the time the current season ends. That intervening season, however, can provide opportunities to lay the groundwork to implement the researcher's recommendations that second year.

APPENDIX A

DEFINITIONS, CODING, AND MEANS FOR VARIABLES USED IN THE

QUALITATIVE COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Variable	Definition	Mean
Outcomes		
English-language performance (ENGL PERF)	Performance was in English	0.89
Nostalgic performance (NOST PERF)	Performance premiered and story took place in a location outside the GRZ	0.74
Venues Used as Sites of Political Assembly (POLITICAL)	Performance venue also housed political organizing activities	0.11
Spectacle (SPECTACLE)	Performance utilized a proscenium stage	0.64
All other outcomes (ALL)	Presence of all of the above outcomes.	0.60
Conditions		
Gold Rush (GR)	Presented during the Gold Rush	0.63
English as the official language (ENGL OFFIC)	English was the sole official language where the performance took place	0.83
Community roots outside the GRZ (ROOTS)	None of the communities featured in the performance have their roots in the GRZ	0.96
Community established in the GRZ (ESTAB)	At least one of the communities featured in the performance is established in the GRZ	0.96

Historically relevant architecture (ARCH)	Venue features historically symbolic architecture like Neoclassical, Elizabethan, or Mission	0.56
Rural (RURAL)	Performance took place in a rural location	0.19
Commercial (COMMERCIAL)	All of a venue's income was earned	0.63
Totalizing carceral system (CARCERAL)	Venue is served by a carceral system that monopolizes security	0.70
Ethnographic playwrighting (ETHNO)	Playwright used an ethnographic research methodology	0.07

APPENDIX B

TRUTH TABLE

	GR	ENGL PERF	ENGL OFFIC	NOST PERF	ROOTS	ESTAB	ARCH	POLITICAL	RURAL	COMMERCIAL	SPECTACLE	CARCERAL	ETHNO	ALL
The Drunkard 1852	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.69
The Drunkard 1855	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.69
The Drunkard 1856	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.69
Black-Eyed Susan	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.94
Rent-Day	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.69
Pizarro February 1856	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.69
Pizarro November 1856	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.94
Chinese theatre in Oroville	1.00	0.00	0.50	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.19
Uncle Tom's Cabin February- March 1854	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.69

	GR	ENGL PERF	ENGL OFFIC	NOST PERF	ROOTS	ESTAB	ARCH	POLITICAL	RURAL	COMMERCIAL	SPECTACLE	CARCERAL	ETHNO	ALL
Uncle Tom's Cabin May 1854	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.69
Uncle Tom's Cabin 1858	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.69
Uncle Tom's Cabin 1859	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.69
Uncle Tom's Cabin 1860	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.69
The Octoroon	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.69
The Ninth Wonder of the World	1.00	1.00	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.50
Putnam	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.69
China War	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25
Mother Road	0.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.44
La Commedia of Errors	0.00	0.50	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.31

	GR	ENGL PERF	ENGL OFFIC	NOST PERF	ROOTS	ESTAB	ARCH	POLITICAL	RURAL	COMMERCIAL	SPECTACLE	CARCERAL	ETHNO	ALL
Vietgone	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50
Mamma Mia!	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.75
Cambodian Rock Band	0.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.00	1.00	0.50
Scenes from 71* Years	0.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.63
How to Catch Creation	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.56
Pure Native	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.63
Between Two Knees	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.50
Disneyland	0.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.19
Means	0.63	0.89	0.83	0.74	0.96	0.96	0.56	0.11	0.19	0.63	0.64	0.70	0.07	0.60

REFERENCES CITED

- “A Community Hosted Experience.” *Oregon Shakespeare Festival*, 7 May 2020, <https://www.osfashland.org/lacomediacomunity>.
- “About.” *East West Players*, 26 Feb. 2020, <https://eastwestplayers.org/about-us/>.
- “About Golden Thread Productions.” *Golden Thread Productions*, 2020, <https://goldenthread.org/about/>.
- “About Hispanic Origin.” *United States Census Bureau*, 21 Apr. 2020, <https://www.census.gov/topics/population/hispanic-origin/about.html>.
- “About Race.” *United States Census Bureau*, 16 Oct. 2020, <https://www.census.gov/topics/population/race/about.html>.
- Adams, David Wallace. *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928*. University of Kansas Press, 1995.
- Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival. “Donors.” *Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival*, 2020, <https://aicls.org/about-the-advocates/donors/>.
- Aiken, George L. “Uncle Tom’s Cabin.” *Early American Drama*, edited by Jeffrey H. Richards, Penguin, 1997, pp. 368–443.
- Almaguer, Tomás. *Racial Fault Lines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California*. University of California Press, 1994.
- “Amusements.” *Sacramento Daily Union*, 30 Sept. 1851, <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=SDU18510930.2.12.3&e=-----en--20--1--txt-txIN-----1>. California Digital Newspaper Collection.
- “---.” *Sacramento Daily Union*, 25 Oct. 1854, <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=SDU18541025.2.12.3&srpos=15&e=-----185-en--20--1--txt-txIN-uncle+tom%27s+cabin-----1>. California Digital Newspaper Collection.
- “Amusements.” *Chico Record*, 8 Aug. 1856, <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=CR18560808.2.8.3&srpos=3&e=-----185-en--20--1--txt-txIN-drunkard+theatre-----1>. California Digital Newspaper Collection.
- “Amusements.” *Sacramento Daily Union*, 19 July 1859, <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=SDU18590719.2.18.1&srpos=10&e=-----185-en--20--1--txt-txIN-uncle+tom%27s+cabin-----1>.
- “Amusements This Evening.” *Daily Alta California*, 26 May 1854, <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=DAC18540526.2.14&srpos=3&e=-----185-en--20--1--txt-txIN-uncle+tom%27s+cabin-----1>. California Digital Newspaper Collection.

- “An Old Indian Murdered.” *Mountain Democrat*, 22 Dec. 1860,
<https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/semi-weekly-mountain-democrat/1860-12-22/page-2/>.
- Anderson, R. M. “Dramatic Correspondence.” *Mountain Democrat*, 28 July 1855,
<https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1855-07-28/page-2/>.
- “Another Indian Tragedy.” *Mountain Democrat*, 21 Feb. 1857,
<https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1857-02-21/page-2/>.
- Ateca-Amestoy, Victoria. “Determining Heterogeneous Behavior for Theater Attendance.” *Journal of Cultural Economics*, vol. 32, no. 2, 2, 2008, pp. 127–51.
- Avila, Eric. *Popular Culture in the Age of White Flight: Fear and Fantasy in Suburban Los Angeles*. 1st ed., University of California Press, 2004, <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.libproxy.uoregon.edu/lib/uoregon/detail.action?docID=223652>.
- Baldassare, Mark, et al. “California’s Exclusive Electorate: A New Look at Who Votes and Why It Matters.” *Public Policy Institute of California*, Sept. 2019,
<https://www.ppic.org/publication/californias-exclusive-electorate-a-new-look-at-who-votes-and-why-it-matters/>.
- Bannister, N. H. *Putnam, the Iron Son of '76*. Samuel French, 2019,
<https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=gtRZAAAACAAJ&hl=en&pg=GBS.PA1>.
- Barman, Jean, and Bruce McIntyre Watson. *Leaving Paradise: Indigenous Hawaiians in the Pacific Northwest, 1787-1898*. University of Hawai'i Press, 2006.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Translated by Sheila Faria Glaser, The University of Michigan Press, 1994.
- Beckham, Stephen Dow, editor. *Oregon Indians: Voices from Two Centuries*. Oregon State University Press, 2006.
- Bellini, Vincenzo, and Felici Romani. *Norma: Tragedia lirica in due atti. Opera completa per canto e pianoforte*. Paperbound, Casa Ricordi S.r.l., 2007.
- Bennett, T., et al. *Accounting for Tastes. Australian Everyday Cultures*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.

- Bentham, Jeremy. *Panopticon; or The Inspection House: Containing the Idea of a New Principle of Construction Applicable to Any Sort of Establishment, in Which Persons of Any Description Are to Be Kept under Inspection; and in Particular to Penitentiary-Houses, Prisons, Houses of Industry, Work-Houses, Poor-Houses, Lazarettos, Manufactories, Hospitals, Mad-Houses, and Schools: With a Plan of Management Adapted to the Principle: In a Series of Letters, Written in the Year 1787, from Chrecheff in White Russia. To a Friend in England*. Edited by Miran Bozovic, Verso, 1995, <http://cartome.org/panopticon2.htm>.
- Bharucha, Rustom. *Terror and Performance*. Taylor & Francis, 2016.
- Big Fight at Disney World!* 2020, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IRzK3WpXO1g>.
- Blessing, Patrick Joseph. *West Among Strangers: Irish Migration to California, 1850 to 1880*. University of California, Los Angeles, 1977.
- Bloom, Tracy. "Man Sentenced to 180 Days in Jail for Caught-on-Video Fight at Disneyland's Toontown." *KTLA5*, 28 Feb. 2020, <https://ktla.com/news/man-pleads-guilty-sentenced-to-180-days-in-jail-for-caught-on-video-fight-at-disneylands-toontown/>.
- Boal, Augusto. *Theatre of the Oppressed*. Translated by Charles A. McBride and Maria-Odilia Leal McBride, Seventh Printing, Theatre Communications Group, 2002.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo, et al. "When Whites Flock Together: The Social Psychology of White Habitus." *Critical Sociology*, vol. 32, no. 2–3, 2–3, 2006, pp. 229–53.
- Boucicault, Dion. "The Octoroon." *Early American Drama*, edited by Jeffrey H. Richards, Penguin, 1997, pp. 444–94.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice, Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Brumfield, W. H., and W. J. Burwell. "Democratic Meeting." *Democrat*, 5 May 1855, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1855-05-05/page-2/>.
- Buckley, Thomas. *Standing Ground: Yurok Indian Spirituality, 1850-1990*. University of California Press, 2002.
- Bulwer Lytton, Edward. "Richelieu; or, The Conspiracy." *The Dramatic Works of Edward Bulwer Lytton*, vol. IX, P. F. Collier, pp. 107–78.
- Burchell, R. A. *The San Francisco Irish 1848-1880*. University of California Press, 1980.
- Burwell, Walter J. "Attention, Democrats!" *The Democrat*, 5 May 1855, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1855-05-05/page-2/>.

- California Democratic Party. "Our Party Platform." *CADem: California Democratic Party*, 2020, <https://cadem.org/our-platform/>.
- "California Minstrels." *Mountain Democrat*, 3 May 1856, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1857-04-25/page-2/>.
- "California Proposition 58, Non-English Languages Allowed in Public Education (2016)." *Ballotpedia*, Ballotpedia, [https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_58,_Non-English_Languages_Allowed_in_Public_Education_\(2016\)](https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_58,_Non-English_Languages_Allowed_in_Public_Education_(2016)). Accessed 28 Nov. 2020.
- "California Proposition 227, the 'English in Public Schools' Initiative (1998)." *Ballotpedia*, Ballotpedia, [https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_227,_the_%22English_in_Public_Schools%22_Initiative_\(1998\)](https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_227,_the_%22English_in_Public_Schools%22_Initiative_(1998)). Accessed 28 Nov. 2020.
- California Republican Party. *California Republican Party Platform*. California Republican Party, 2019.
- California State Board of Education. "Content Standards." *California State Board of Education*, 21 Aug. 2020, <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/index.asp>.
- "Chinese Theatre." *Oroville Daily Butte Record*, 11 Feb. 1857, <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=CR18570211.2.5&srpos=3&e=-----185-en--20--1-byDA-txt-txIN-%22chinese+theatre%22----1857---1>. California Digital Newspaper Collection.
- "Community." *Japan Center Malls*, 2020, <https://japancentersf.com/about/community/>.
- Cook, Sherburne F. *The Conflict between the California Indian and White Civilization: II*. University of California Press, 1943.
- Cooper Center. *Racial Dot Map*. University of Virginia, <https://demographics.virginia.edu/DotMap/>.
- Cox, Isaac. *The Annals of Trinity County*. John Henry Nash, 1858. University of Oregon Special Collections and University Archives, Rare Books.
- Cronqvist, Lasse. *QCA Add-In*. 1.1, University of Trier, 2019, <https://www.qca-addin.net/>.
- de Russailh, Albert Bernard. *Last Adventure: San Francisco in 1851*. Translated by Clarkson Crane, The Westgate Press, 1931.
- Debord, Guy. *Society of the Spectacle*. 1st ed., Soul Bay Press Ltd, 2009.
- DeLoughrey, Elizabeth M. *Routes and Roots: Navigating Caribbean and Pacific Island Literatures*. University of Hawai'i Press, 2007.

- “Democratic Primary Meetings.” *The Democrat*, 8 July 1854,
<https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1854-07-08/page-2/>. Newspaper Archive.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Rogues: Two Essays on Reason*. Translated by Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas, Stanford University Press, 2005.
- Devers, Kelly J., et al. *Using Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) to Study Patient-Centered Medical Homes: An Introductory Guide*. Urban Institute, Sept. 2013, p. 42.
- Domosh, Mona. “A ‘civilized’ Commerce: Gender, ‘Race’, and Empire at the 1893 Chicago Exposition.” *Cultural Geographies*, vol. 9, 2002, pp. 181–201.
- Donald Trump Presidential Campaign Announcement Full Speech (C-SPAN)*. 2015,
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=apjNfkysjbM>.
- DuVernay, Ava. *13th*. Kandoo Films, 2016,
<https://www.netflix.com/watch/80091741?trackId=13752289&tctx=0%2C3%2Cafdfd72c7c3d8d7e67f97ff3484ee1cd8ff13b99%3Ac07fe2c72486bc701e37c162f037d16e62705849%2Cafdfd72c7c3d8d7e67f97ff3484ee1cd8ff13b99%3Ac07fe2c72486bc701e37c162f037d16e62705849%2Cunknown%2C>. Netflix.
- East West Players. *Mamma Mia! Mamma Mia!*, Los Angeles.
- “Enthusiastic Democratic Meeting.” *The Democrat*, 19 May 1855,
<https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1855-05-19/page-2/>. California Digital Newspaper Collection.
- Fenelon, James V. “Critique of Glenn on Settler Colonialism and Bonilla-Silva on Critical Race Analysis from Indigenous Perspectives.” *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2, 2016, pp. 237–42.
- Foster, Lois. *Annals of the San Francisco Stage, 1850-1880*. Federal Theatre Projects, 1936,
<https://archive.org/details/annalsofsanfranc01fost>.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, Vintage Books, 1995.
- Frick, John W. “‘NOT from the Drowsy Pulpit!’: The Moral Reform Melodrama on the Nineteenth-Century Stage.” *Theatre and Moral Order*, edited by M. Scott Phillips, vol. 15, Southeastern Theatre Conference and The University of Alabama Press, 2007, pp. 41–51.
- “Frontierland.” *Disneyland Resort*, 10 Sept. 2020, disneyland.disney.go.com.
- Gabbard, Ashley, et al. *Offender Data Points: Offender Demographics for the 24-Month Period Ending December 2018*. California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Jan. 2020, p. 102.

- Glanz, Rudolf. *The Jews of California*. Walden Press, Inc., 1960.
- Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. "Settler Colonialism as Structure: A Framework for Comparative Studies of U.S. Race and Gender Formation." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1, 2015, pp. 52–72.
- Golden Thread. *Scenes from 71* Years*. Scenes from 71* Years, Golden Thread.
- Gras, Henk, et al. "Did Men of Taste and Civilization Save the Stage? Theater-Going in Rotterdam, 1860-1916. A Statistical Analysis of Ticket Sales." *Journal of Social History*, vol. 36, no. 3, 3, Spring 2003, pp. 615–55.
- Gudde, Erwin G. *German Pioneers in Early California*. The Concord Society, 1927.
- "Guest Relations." *Disneyland Resort*, 10 Sept. 2020, disneyland.disney.go.com.
- Gutfreund, Zevi. "Standing Up to Sugar Cubes: The Contest over Ethnicity in California's Fourth-Grade Mission Curriculum." *Southern California Quarterly*, vol. 92, no. 2, 2, 2010, pp. 161–97.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Translated by Lewis A. Coser, University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Hannah, Dorita. *Event-Space: Theatre Architecture and the Historical Avant-Garde*. Routledge, 2019,
http://web.a.ebscohost.com.libproxy.uoregon.edu/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/bmx1YmtfXzE3ODEwNDFFX0FO0?sid=85cf10f7-badb-408f-ba32-4a66f6d7f535@sdv-sessmgr01&vid=0&format=EB&lpid=lp_53&rid=0.
- "Hard to Please." *Mountain Democrat*, 3 May 1856,
<https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1857-04-25/page-2/>.
- Harvey, O. "National Road Meeting." *Mountain Democrat*, 27 Jan. 1855,
<https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1855-01-27/page-3/>.
- Harvey, O., and W. Wadsworth. "Wagon Road Meeting." *Mountain Democrat*, 12 Apr. 1856,
<https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1856-04-12/page-2/>.
- Hauser, Casper. *Daily Herald*, 8 Nov. 1855,
<https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=MDH18551108.2.10&srpos=4&e=-----185-en--20--1--txt-txIN-borneo----1855---1>. California Digital Newspaper Collection.
- Heizer, Robert F., editor. *The Destruction of California Indians: A Collection of Documents from the Period 1847 to 1865 in Which Are Described Some of the Things That Happened to Some of the Indians of California*. University of Nebraska Press, 1993.

- Heizer, Robert F., and Alan J. Almquist. *Other Californians: Prejudice and Discrimination under Spain, Mexico, and the United States to 1920*. University of California Press, 1971.
- Hevey, David. *The Creatures Time Forgot: Photography and Disability Imagery*. Routledge, 1992.
- Hinton, Leanne, et al. *How to Keep Your Language Alive: A Commonsense Approach to One-on-One Language Learning*. Heyday, 2002.
- “HISTORY - Walking Tour of Old Placerville.” *Elk Grove Historical Society*, 10 June 2020, <https://elkgrovehistoricalsociety.com/walking-tour-of-old-placerville/>.
- Holledge, Julie, and Joanne Tompkins. *Women’s Intercultural Performance: Cultural Double Cross*. Routledge, 2000, <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.libproxy.uoregon.edu/lib/uoregon/detail.action?docID=165867>.
- “Hotels.” *Sacramento Daily Union*, 30 Sept. 1851, <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=SDU18510930.2.13.3&e=-----en--20--1--txt-txIN-----1>. California Digital Newspaper Collection.
- Hughes, Amy E. *Spectacles of Reform: Theater and Activism in Nineteenth-Century America*. The University of Michigan Press, 2012, [https://www.fulcrum-org.libproxy.uoregon.edu/ebooks/2801ph11t?locale=en#/6/2\[cov01\]/4/1:0](https://www.fulcrum-org.libproxy.uoregon.edu/ebooks/2801ph11t?locale=en#/6/2[cov01]/4/1:0).
- Hugo, Victor. *Lucretia Borgia*. Translated by J. M. Weston, W. V. Spencer.
- Hunt, Darnell, et al. *Hollywood Diversity Report 2020: A Tale of Two Hollywoods*. no. Part 1: Film, Part 1: Film, UCLA College of Social Sciences, 2020, p. 46.
- Jenks, Julia. *THEME Report*. MPA, 2019, p. 59.
- Jerrold, Douglas. “Black-Eyed Susan, or All in the Downs: A Nautical Drama in Three Acts.” *English Plays of the Nineteenth Century*, edited by Michael R. Booth, vol. 1, Clarendon Press, 1969.
- . “Rent-Day.” *British Plays of the Nineteenth Century; An Anthology to Illustrate the Evolution of the Drama*, edited by James Osler Bailey, Odyssey Press, 1966, pp. 258–80.
- “John Hyde Cut Off Root and Branch.” *San Joaquin Republican*, 19 Mar. 1857, <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=SRP18570318.2.5&srpos=1&e=-----185-en--20--1--txt-txIN-hyde-----1>. California Digital Newspaper Collection.
- Jones, Bill. *Supplement to the Statement of Vote - June 2, 1998 Primary Election Statewide Summary by County*. California Secretary of State, 2 June 1998.
- Jones, William. “Resolutions of the Confidence Engine Co.” *Mountain Democrat*, 12 Dec. 1857, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1857-12-12/page-3/>.

- Kanellos, Nicolás. "An Overview of Hispanic Theatre in the United States." *Hispanic Theatre in the United States*, edited by Nicolás Kanellos, Arte Publico Press, 1984, pp. 7–13.
- Katz, Abigail. "Dramaturg's Note." *Pure Native: A New Comedy*, 2019, p. 2.
- Kelly, J. G. "The Falstaff of Shakspeare." *Overland Monthly*, vol. 13, no. 4, 4, Oct. 1874, pp. 352–56. University of Oregon Special Collections and University Archives.
- Kenderdine, T. S. *A California Tramp and Later Footprints; or, Life Ont He Plains and in the Golden State Thirty Years Ago, with Miscellaneous Sketches in Prose and Verse*. 1888, <https://archive.org/details/californiatramp100kend/page/n7>.
- Kim, Jongsung. *Labor Supply and Occupational Structure of Asian Immigrants in the U.S. Labor Market*. Garland Publishing, Inc., 1999.
- Knowles, James Sheridan. "William Tell: A Play." *The Dramatic Works of James Sheridan Knowles*, vol. I, Routledge, 1856, pp. 113–76.
- Lacy, Karyn R. "Black Spaces, Black Places: Strategic Assimilation and Identity Construction in Middle-Class Suburbia." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 27, no. 6, 6, Nov. 2004, pp. 908–30, doi:[10.1080/0141987042000268521](https://doi.org/10.1080/0141987042000268521).
- Lai, Clement. "The Racial Triangulation of Space: The Case of Urban Renewal in San Francisco's Fillmore District." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 102, no. 1, 1, 2012, pp. 151–70, doi:[10.1080/00045608.2011.58572](https://doi.org/10.1080/00045608.2011.58572).
- Landis, Michael Todd. *Northern Men with Southern Loyalties: The Democratic Party and the Sectional Crisis*. 1st ed., Cornell University Press, 2014, <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.libproxy.uoregon.edu/lib/uoregon/detail.action?docID=3138669>.
- Language Spoken At Home*. Census, S1601, United States Census Bureau, 2019, https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=language%20spoken%20at%20home&t=Language%20Spoken%20at%20Home&g=0400000US06_0500000US41029,41033&tid=ACST1Y2019.S1601&hidePreview=true.
- "Languages of California." *Survey of California and Other Indian Languages*, 23 Jan. 2020, <http://cla.berkeley.edu/california-languages.php>.
- Lapp, Rudolph. *Afro-Americans in California*. Boyd and Fraser, 1979.
- "Lecture on Mormonism, Brigham Young, &c." *Mountain Democrat*, 7 Mar. 1857, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1857-03-07/page-2/>.
- Levinson, Robert E. *The Jews in the California Gold Rush*. Ktav Publishing House, 1978.

- Liévanos, Raoul S. "Racialized Uneven Development and Systemic Risk: Sea Level Rise and High-Risk Neighborhoods in Stockton, California." *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, vol. 13, no. 2, Aug. 2020, pp. 381–404.
- Lindsay, Brendan C. *Murder State: California's Native American Genocide, 1846-1873*. University of Nebraska Press, 2012, <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.libproxy.uoregon.edu/lib/uoregon/detail.action?docID=915522>.
- Lloyd, B. E. *Lights and Shades in San Francisco*. A. L. Bancroft & Company, 1876, <https://archive.org/details/lightsshadesins00lloy/page/n9>.
- Lovell, Maria. *Ingomar, The Barbarian*. Walter H. Baker & Co., 1896, <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/hvd.hwp4i6>.
- Maira, Sunaina. "Belly-Dancing: Arab-Face, Orientalist Feminism, and U.S. Empire." *American Quarterly*, vol. 60, no. 2, 2, June 2008, pp. 317–45.
- . "Temporary Tattoos: Indo-Chic Fantasies and Late Capitalist Orientalism." *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism*, vol. 3, no. 1, 1, 2002, pp. 134–60.
- "Making Up to the Know Nothings." *Mountain Democrat*, 3 May 1856, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1857-04-25/page-2/>.
- Mamouljian, Rouben. *The Mark of Zorro*. Twentieth Century Fox, 1940.
- Marr, Matthew D. "Pathways Out of Homelessness in Los Angeles and Tokyo: Multilevel Contexts of Limited Mobility Amid Advanced Urban Marginality." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 36, no. 5, Sept. 2012, pp. 980–1006, doi:[10.1111/j.1468-2427.2012.01111.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2012.01111.x).
- Martin, Scott C. *Devil of the Domestic Sphere: Temperance, Gender, and Middle-Class Ideology, 1800-1860*. Northern Illinois University Press, 2008.
- May, Stephen. *Language and Minority Rights: Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Politics of Language*. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2011, <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.libproxy.uoregon.edu/lib/uoregon/detail.action?docID=958376>.
- McVickar, John. *Outlines of Political Economy*. Wilder & Campbell, 1825.
- Menon, Jisha. *The Performance of Nationalism: India, Pakistan, and the Memory of Partition*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- "Musical - Theatrical." *Daily Alta California*, 12 Apr. 1855, <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=DAC18550412.2.14&srpos=8&e=-----185-en--20--1--txt-txIN-drunkard+theatre-----1>. California Digital Newspaper Collection.

- “Musical Theatrical.” *Daily Alta California*, 6 Sept. 1855,
<https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=DAC18550906.2.14&srpos=3&e=-----185-en--20--1--txt-txIN-%22musical+theatrical%22----1855---1>. California Digital Newspaper Collection.
- Najjar, Michael Malek. *Arab American Drama, Film and Performance*. McFarland & Company, 2015.
- National Endowment for the Arts. *Survey of Public Participation in the Arts 2017*. National Endowment for the Arts, 2018.
- Native Voices at the Autry. *Pure Native*. Pure Native, Los Angeles.
- Nelson, Byron. *Our Home Forever: The Hupa Indians of Northern California*. Third, Hupa Tribe, 1978.
- Newkirk, Vann R. “The Myth of Reverse Racism.” *The Atlantic*, Aug. 2017,
<https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2017/08/myth-of-reverse-racism/535689/>.
- Nguyen, Qui. “Vietgone.” *American Theatre*, vol. 34, no. 2, 2, Feb. 2017, pp. 48–67.
- “Ninth Wonder of the World.” *The Democrat*, 25 Aug. 1855,
<https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1855-08-25/page-3/>.
- Nolan, Yvette. *Medicine Shows: Indigenous Performance Culture*. Playwrights Canada Press, 2015.
- Nora, Pierre. “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire.” *Representations*, translated by Marc Roudebush, vol. 26, no. Memory and Counter-Memory, Memory and Counter-Memory, Spring 1989, pp. 7–25.
- Nora, Pierre, and Lawrence D. Kritzman, editors. *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer, vol. 1: Conflicts and Divisions, Columbia University Press, 1996.
- Norton, Jack. *Centering in Two Worlds: Essays on Native Northwestern California History, Culture and Spirituality*. CARE, 2007.
- Norton, Jack. *Genocide in Northwestern California*. Indian Historian Press, 1979.
- Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1980s*. Routledge, 1986.
- Ong, Paul M. “Chinese Labor in Early San Francisco: Racial Segmentation and Industrial Expansion.” *Amerasia Journal*, vol. 8, no. 1, 1, 1981, pp. 69–92. Knight Periodicals.
- Oregon Shakespeare Festival. *Between Two Knees*. Between Two Knees, Ashland.

---. *Cambodian Rock Band*. Cambodian Rock Band, Ashland.

---. *How to Catch Creation*. How to Catch Creation, Ashland.

---. *La Comedia of Errors*. La Commedia of Errors, Ashland.

---. *Mother Road*. Mother Road, Ashland.

ORIGINAL PUBLISHER: *Fight At Disneyland ToonTown* 7/6/19. WARNING: GRAPHIC. 2019, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I7gtoLmHd5w>.

Padilla, Alex. *Supplement to the Statement of Vote Statewide Summary by County for State Ballot Measures*. California Secretary of State, 2016.

Payne, John Howard. "Mazeppa; Or, The Wild Horse of Tartary." *America's Lost Plays*, edited by Codman Hislop and W. R. Richardson, vol. 6, Indiana University Press, 1940, pp. 163–204.

Pfaelzer, Jean. *Driven Out: The Forgotten War against Chinese Americans*. Random House, 2007.

"Pioneer Association." *The Democrat*, 1 Dec. 1855, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1855-12-01/page-2/>.

"Placer Theatre." *The Democrat*, 28 July 1855, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1855-07-28/page-2/>.

"Placerville Theatre." *Mountain Democrat*, 15 Nov. 1856, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1856-11-15/page-2/>.

Powers, Stephen. "The Northern California Indians. No. I." *Overland Monthly*, vol. 8, no. 4, 4, Apr. 1872, pp. 325–33. University of Oregon Special Collections and University Archives.

---. "The Northern California Indians. No. VI." *Overland Monthly*, vol. 9, no. 6, 6, Dec. 1872, pp. 498–507. University of Oregon Special Collections and University Archives.

Prendergast, Thomas F. *Forgotten Pioneers: Irish Leaders in Early California*. Books for Libraries Press, 1942.

Pulido, Laura. *Black, Brown, Yellow, and Left: Radical Activism in Los Angeles*. 1st ed., University of California Press, 2006, <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.libproxy.uoregon.edu/lib/uoregon/detail.action?docID=239228>.

- Race*. Census, B02001, United States Census Bureau, 2019, https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=race&g=0400000US06.050000_0500000US41029,41033&tid=ACSDT1Y2019.B02001&hidePreview=true.
- Raup, Hallock F. "The German Colonization of Anaheim, California." *University of California Publications in Geography*, vol. 6, no. 3, Aug. 1932, pp. 123–46.
- Rawls, James. *Indians of California: The Changing Image*. University of Oklahoma Press, 1984.
- Reinholz, Randy. *In the University of Oregon Theatre Department's Intercultural Theatre Seminar*. 15 Mar. 2018.
- "Research to Improve Data on Race and Ethnicity." *United States Census Bureau*, 6 Mar. 2017, <https://www.census.gov/about/our-research/race-ethnicity.html>.
- Robinson, Dylan. "Welcoming Sovereignty." *Performing Indigeneity*, edited by Yvette Nolan and Ric Knowles, Playwrights Canada Press, 2016, pp. 5–32.
- Rohrer, Judy. *Staking Claim: Settler Colonialism and Racialization in Hawai'i*. University of Arizona Press, 2016, <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.libproxy.uoregon.edu/lib/uoregon/detail.action?docID=4509625>.
- Rosenbaum, Fred. *Free to Choose: The Making of a Jewish Community in the American West*. The Judah L. Magnes Memorial Museum, 1976.
- Rosenthal, Nicolas G. *Reimagining Indian Country: Native American Migration & Identity in Twentieth Century Los Angeles*. University of North Carolina Press, 2012.
- Rowe, E. A. "Great Fight Among Chinamen - Ten Men Killed." *The Democrat*, 22 July 1854, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1854-07-22/page-2/>.
- "Rumored Indian Murders." *Mountain Democrat*, 12 Dec. 1857, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1857-12-12/page-3/>.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. 1st ed., Pantheon, 1978.
- Sewell, Jr., William H. *Logics of History: Social Theory and Social Transformation*. Kindle, University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Sex By Occupation for the Civilian Employed Population 16 Years and Over*. Census, B24010, United States Census Bureau, 2019, [ACSDT1Y2019.B24010](https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=sex&g=0400000US06.050000_0500000US41029,41033&tid=ACSDT1Y2019.B24010&hidePreview=true).
- Shakespeare, William. "King Lear." *The Norton Shakespeare: Later Plays and Poems*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt et al., 3rd ed., vol. 2, W. W. Norton & Company, 2016, pp. 613–866.

- . "Merchant of Venice." *The Norton Shakespeare: Early Plays and Poems*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt and Leah S. Marcus, 3rd ed., vol. 1, W. W. Norton & Company, 2016, pp. 1327–94.
 - . "Merry Wives of Windsor." *The Norton Shakespeare: Early Plays and Poems*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt and Helen Ostovich, 3rd ed., vol. 1, W. W. Norton & Company, 2016, pp. 1463–532.
 - . "Othello." *The Norton Shakespeare*, 3rd ed., vol. 2, W. W. Norton & Company, 2016, pp. 369–454.
 - . "Richard the Third." *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, 3rd ed., vol. 1, W. W. Norton & Company, 2016, pp. 555–647.
 - . "The Comedy of Errors." *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt and James A. Knapp, 3rd ed., vol. 1, W. W. Norton & Company, 2016, pp. 754–97.
 - . "The Second Part of Henry the Fourth." *The Norton Shakespeare*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt and Line Cottegnies, 3rd ed., vol. 1, W. W. Norton & Company, 2016, pp. 1245–326.
- Sheridan, Richard Brinsley. *Pizarro; A Tragedy in Five Acts; As Performed at the Theatre Royal in Drury-Lane*. 1799,
http://find.galegroup.com.libproxy.uoregon.edu/ecco/retrieve.do?inPS=true&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=euge94201&tabID=T001&bookId=1662101700&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&contentSet=ECCOArticles&showLOI=&docId=CB3326688554&docLevel=FA SCIMILE&workId=CB126688554&relevancePageBatch=CB126688554&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&callistoContentSet=ECLL&docPage=article&hilite=y.
 Eighteenth Century Collections Online.
- . "The Rivals." *Richard Brinsley Sheridan (Six Plays)*, Hill and Wang, 1957, pp. 1–84.
 - . "The School for Scandal." *Richard Brinsley Sheridan (Six Plays)*, edited by Louis Kronenberger, Hill and Wang, 1957, pp. 221–309.
- Shimakawa, Karen. *National Abjection: The Asian American Body Onstage*. Duke University Press, 2002.
- Sifuentez, Mario Jimenez. *Of Forests and Fields: Mexican Labor in the Pacific Northwest*. Rutgers University Press, 2016.
- Simpson, Audra. *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*. Duke University Press, 2014.
- Smilde, David. "A Qualitative Comparative Analysis of Conversion to Venezuelan Evangelicalism: How Networks Matter." *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 111, no. 3, 3, Nov. 2005, pp. 757–96.

Smith, Sharon G., et al. *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey: 2010-2012 State Report*. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, 2017, p. 272.

Smith, William Henry. "The Drunkard; or, The Fallen Saved." *Earl American Drama*, edited by Jeffrey H. Richards, Penguin, 1997, pp. 248–303.

Solis, Octavio. *Mother Road*. 2015.

Soulé, Frank, et al. *The Annals of San Francisco; Containing a Summary of the History of the First Discovery Settlement, Progress, and Present Condition of California, and a Complete History of All the Important Events Connected with Its Great City: To Which Are Added, Biographical Memoirs of Some Prominent Citizens*. D. Appleton & Company, 1855, <https://archive.org/details/annalssanfranci00nisbgoog/page/n7>.

Tangen, Rulan. "Statement of Global Indigenous Identity and Solidarity." *Dancing Earth*, 12 Oct. 2020, <https://dancingearth.org/news-blog/statement-of-global-indigenous-identity-and-solidarity>.

Taylor, Diana. *Disappearing Acts: Spectacles of Gender and Nationalism in Argentina's "Dirty War"*. Duke University Press, 1997.

"The Chapman Family." *The Democrat*, 14 Apr. 1855, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1855-04-14/page-2/>.

"The Emigrant Question." *The Democrat*, 28 July 1855, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1855-07-28/page-2/>.

"The Wonderful Living Nondescript." *Daily Union*, 27 Dec. 1855, <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=SDU18551227.2.11.1&srpos=9&e=-----185-en--20--1--txt-txIN-borneo----1855---1>. California Digital Newspaper Collection.

Theatre Communications Group. *Theatre Facts 2017: Theatre Communications Group's Report on the Fiscal State of the U.S. Professional Not-For-Profit Theatre Field*. Theatre Communications Group, 2017.

"Theatrical." *Daily Alta California*, 4 Feb. 1852, <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=DAC18520204.2.6&srpos=6&e=-----185-en--20--1--txt-txIN-drunkard+theatre-----1>. California Digital Newspaper Collection.

"---." *Daily Alta California*, 4 Feb. 1852, <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=DAC18520204.2.6&srpos=6&e=-----185-en--20--1--txt-txIN-drunkard+theatre-----1>. California Digital Newspaper Collection.

- “---.” *Daily Alta California*, 5 Feb. 1852, <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=DAC18520205.2.3&e=---185-en--20--1--txt-txIN-drunkard+theatre-----1>. California Digital Newspaper Collection.
- “---.” *The Democrat*, 26 Jan. 1856, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1856-01-26/page-2/>.
- “---.” *The Democrat*, 19 Apr. 1856, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1856-04-19/page-2/>.
- “---.” *Mountain Democrat*, 8 Nov. 1856, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1856-11-08/page-2/>.
- “---.” *Mountain Democrat*, 15 Nov. 1856, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1856-11-15/page-2/>.
- “---.” *Mountain Democrat*, 21 Feb. 1857, <https://mountaindemocrat.newspaperarchive.com/placerville-mountain-democrat/1857-02-21/page-2/>.
- Tran, Diep. “Cambodian Rock Band.” *Illuminations*, 2019, pp. 24–29.
- “Union Center for the Arts.” *East West Players*, 26 Feb. 2020, <https://eastwestplayers.org/theatre-history/>.
- Wagemann, Claudius, and Carsten Q. Schneider. “Standards of Good Practice in Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and Fuzzy-Sets.” *Neue Vergleichende Sozialwissenschaftliche Methoden*, edited by Susanne Pickel et al.
- Wells, Harry L. *History of Siskiyou County, California. Illustrated with Views of Residences, Business Buildings and Natural Scenery and Containing Portraits and Biographies of Its Leading Citizens and Pioneers*. D. J. Stewart & Co., 1881.
- “Wild Men of Borneo.” *Daily Alta California*, 27 Mar. 1855, <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=DAC18550327.2.4&srpos=1&e=-----185-en--20--1--txt-txIN-borneo----1855---1>.
- Yazzie, Rhiana. “On Colonization, Racial Supremacy and Playing Indian: A Response to ‘Statement of Global Indigenous Identity and Solidarity.’” *Indianz.Com*, 14 Oct. 2020.
- Yee, Lauren. “Cambodian Rock Band.” *American Theatre*, Aug. 2018, pp. 48–70.
- Yew, Chay. “From the Director.” *Oregon Shakespeare Festival Playbill*, vol. 2, 2019, p. 30.